

➤ HEBRAICA. ➤

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1886.

NO. I.

THE ALLEGED COMPOSITE CHARACTER OF EXODUS I., II.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN, D. D., LL. D.,

Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

The character and cogency of the arguments for the critical division of Exodus may be illustrated by testing them in their application to the opening chapters of this book. Exodus I.-XI. contain an account of Israel in Egypt until the institution of the Passover and the plague of slaying the first-born on the night of the departure out of the land. This may be conveniently divided into three sections, viz., (1) I., II., the multiplication of Israel, their oppression, the birth of Moses and his flight to Midian; (2) III. 1-VII. 7, the call and mission of Moses; (3) VII. 8-XI. 10, the plagues of Egypt.

The first section is parcelled by different critics as follows:

Knobel, Elohist, I. 1-7, 13, 14; II. 23-25.

Jehovist, I. 8-12, 15-22; II. 1-22 (he follows the *Kriegsbuch* in II. 11-22).

Kayser, Elohist, I. 1-4, 5*b*, 7*, 13, 14; II. 23*b*-25.

Jehovist, I. 6, 8-12, 15-22, II. 1-23*a*.

Redactor, I. 5*a*.

Nöldeke, Grundschrift, I. 1-5, 7*, 13, 14*, II. 23 (from וַיֵּאָחֲזוּ)-25; VI. 2 seq.

Second Elohist, I. 6, 8-12.

The Redactor has inserted from B in I. 7 (וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ... וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ) see verse 9, and from other sources in I. 14 (בַּחֹמֶר וּבִלְבָנִים) or at least וּבִלְבָנִים see chapter V.

Dillmann, A, I. 1-5, 7, 13 seq.; II. 23*b*-25; VI. 2 seq. (I. 6 probably does not belong to A).

B, I. 8-12, 15-22; II. 1-14.

C, II. 15-23*a*.

Wellhausen, Q, I. 1-5, 7* (except וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ וַיִּרְבוּ see verses 9, 20), 13, 14* (except second half of 14*a* and prefixing 14*b*); II. 23*b*-25; VI. 2 seq.

* An asterisk attached to a figure indicates that the verse is not retained in its original form, but has undergone more or less modification.

JE, I. 6, 8-12, 15-22 (some words from verses 7, 14a); II. 1-23a.

J, I. 6, 7* (וירבו ויצצמו), 8-10, (עבדה בשרה),
14a*, 20b, 22; II. 11-22.

E, I. 11, 12, 15-20a, 21; II. 1-10.

Schrader, *Annalist*, I. 1-6, 7, 13, 14; II. 23b-25.

Theocratic, I. 8-12, 15-22; II. 1-14.

Prophetic, II. 15-23a.

According to these critical schemes the Elohist says nothing whatever of the birth of Moses, or the cruel edict of the king of Egypt to slay the Hebrew children, nothing of Moses being found by Pharaoh's daughter or brought up by her, and nothing of his flight to Midian. He is not once mentioned, until God suddenly reveals himself to him in Egypt without any antecedent explanation (VI. 2 seq.) and commissions him to be the deliverer of Israel. The Elohist's account preceding the call of Moses is limited to a brief recapitulation of the sons of Jacob, who came with him and with their households into Egypt, and their immense multiplication (verse 7). Upon this follows without any further explanation the statement (verses 13, 14) of their being grievously oppressed by the Egyptians; then (II. 23b-25) their sighing by reason of their bondage and God's gracious purpose to deliver them; whereupon he reveals himself to Moses and summons him to this work (VI. 2 seq.) without the reason having been told that such a person as Moses existed. Kuenen (*Hexateuch*, p. 69) owns that Moses could not have been so abruptly introduced. "This revelation must have been preceded by some details concerning Moses, which have not been able to hold their place by the side of the more elaborate narrative of Exod. II.-V. drawn from other sources."

These verses thus arbitrarily sundered from the context in which they stand, and where they are in every case appropriate and suitably connected, are assigned to the Elohist on the ground of their alleged peculiar style and diction and allusions which they contain to other parts of the Elohim document. The name Elohim occurs in the last three of these verses (II. 23b-25), but so it does in I. 17, 20, 21, which are not referred to him, and in fact Elohim is the only name of God that occurs in the course of these chapters, so that it affords no criterion of partition. The genealogical list of the sons of Jacob (I. 1-5), it is said, must belong to the Elohist, since he is partial to genealogies and it is he that invariably records them. And yet the critics differ among themselves on this point. The detailed list of Jacob's family that went with him into Egypt (Gen. XLVI. 8-26) is indeed referred to the Elohist by Dillmann, Schrader and Nöldeke; but Hupfeld and Böhmer assign it to the Jehovist, to whose preceding statements it contains many manifest allusions (Kays. p. 30, note), and Kayser maintains that it belongs neither to the Elohist nor to the Jehovist, but has been inserted by the Redactor (p. 31, yet see his statement p. 36 that all such lists belonged to the Jehovist). In this conflict of opinion the list of names of itself can hardly be regarded as deciding in

favor of the Elohist in this instance; nor can the expressions (I. 5) "souls" in the sense of persons, and "came out of the loins of," which are common to both lists, be classed as peculiarly Elohistie. Kayser, in fact, claims (p. 36) that the first part of I. 5, in which these expressions occur, viz., "and all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls" is an insertion by the Redactor, because it interrupts the connection; and that the last clause of verse 5 should be joined directly with verse 4. Exod. I. 5 **יָצְאוּ יָרֵךְ** and Gen. XLVI. 26 **יָצְאוּ יָרֵכָה** are the only passages in which this phrase occurs; in Gen. XXXV. 11 **מִחֲלָצִיךָ יָצָא** the same idea is somewhat differently phrased, and the critics would cite this in evidence of diversity of writers if it suited their purpose. And further, the affirmation that this list (Exod. I. 1-5) belongs to the Elohist because that in Gen. XLVI., upon which it is evidently based and from which it is condensed, belongs to him, is directly in the face of the critical dictum that parallel passages are an indication of distinct writers, and that one renders the other superfluous.

In I. 7 the vast multiplication of the children of Israel is expressed by heaping together a number of synonymous terms and adding intensive adverbs, **פָּרוּ וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ וַיִּרְבוּ וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ בְּמֵאד מְאֹד**, "were fruitful and increased abundantly and multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty." Now this would answer very well for the Elohist, who is said to be very diffuse in his expressions and to be very fond of multiplying words, an instance of which is alleged in I. 1; and all of these words but **עָצַם** occur singly or together in other Elohistie passages. But the perplexing thing about it is that some of these same words are used with evident reference to this passage in the verses that immediately follow, which are by the critics assigned to an independent writer. In verse 9 the king of Egypt says, "the children of Israel are **רַב וְעָצוּם** more and mightier than we," a plain allusion to the **וַיִּרְבוּ וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ** of verse 7. So verse 20, **וַיִּרְבֶּה הָעָם וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ בְּמֵאד מְאֹד**, "and the people multiplied and waxed very mighty" alludes to **וַיִּרְבוּ וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ בְּמֵאד מְאֹד** of verse 7, "multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty." The natural inference from these cross references would be that chapter I. is continuous throughout, the product of a single writer. But the critics have decreed otherwise, though they show their perplexity by their lack of unanimity as to the mode of dealing with this difficulty. As "be fruitful and multiply" **פָּרוּ וַיִּרְבוּ** often occur together in Elohistie passages (Gen. I. 22, 28; XVII. 20; XXVIII. 3; XXXV. 11; XLVIII. 4), Nöldeke claims that these were the only verbs in the verse in its original form as it stood in the Elohim document, and that the other two **וַיַּעֲצֻמוּ... וַיִּשְׂרְצוּ** were inserted by the Redactor from the other document, which must have contained a parallel statement. Each writer spoke of the multiplication of the children of Israel and used two different verbs to describe it. But the Redactor (or compiler) has fused both sentences together and retained all four of the verbs; though it is somewhat singular that in doing so he should thrust one verb from each writer between the two of the other, taking the first and third from one, the second and

fourth from the other. But as שָׂרַץ also often occurs in the Elohist (I. 20, 21, etc.), and that too in immediate connection with פָּרָה and רָבָה, e. g., Gen. VIII. 17; IX. 7, Knobel thinks that these three verbs were [in the verse in its original form and only the remaining one (עָצַם) was supplied by the Redactor. This, however, loses sight of the fact that both רָבָה and עָצַם are plainly alluded to in the רָב וְעָצַם of verse 9, which is attributed to the other document. Accordingly, to make the critical jargon complete, Wellhausen pares away both of these verbs from verse 7, leaving only פָּרָה and שָׂרַץ "were fruitful and increased abundantly" to it in its original form; although these two are never joined together elsewhere without רָבָה accompanying them.

There is a critical disagreement also about verse 6, "And Joseph died and all his brethren and all that generation." Hupfeld (p. 86) and Schrader leave it with the passage assigned to the Elohist, to which it naturally belongs and of which it is an appropriate part. But this evidently prepares the way for verse 8 and the narrative that follows, thus binding the whole together as one continuous passage. Consequently Nöldeke, followed by Kayser, Dillmann and Wellhausen, felt it to be necessary to cut verse 6 out of its proper connection and assign it to the other document as the beginning of the account continued in verses 8 seq.

With this diversity among the critics themselves, and the facts of the case being as already stated, it can scarcely be said that any very clear proof has been given that the opening verses of this chapter are to be sundered from what follows, and assigned to a separate Elohist document.

I pass now to the next passage which the critics unanimously assign to the Elohist, verses 13, 14. Here we suddenly find without any intimation of a change of policy that the Egyptians, who with their king were so friendly to Jacob and his descendants, "made the children of Israel to serve with rigor." This needs for its explanation the very verses which have here been cut out and assigned to the other document, verses 8-10. But it is alleged that verses 13, 14 simply repeat what is already contained in verses 11, 12, and moreover they have a peculiar diction which shows them to belong to the Elohist. But these verses are not superfluous in connection with what precedes. It is evident on inspection that there is no mere tautology, nor even unnecessary redundancy, but rather an endeavor on the part of the writer to impress his readers with the severity of the bondage imposed on the Israelites; so that he dwells upon the subject, using more intense expressions and adding fresh particulars. That the one passage is not a bare repetition of the other is further apparent from the confession of some of the critics themselves, who claim that these verses imply a different conception of the tasks imposed upon the Israelites from the preceding. One passage speaks of "burdens" or loads which they had to carry and of cities which they helped to build, the other of "hard bondage in mortar and brick and in all manner of service in the field." But this is no contrariety in the view taken of Egyptian bondage; it is simply an

additional item in its description, and involves therefore no suspicion of a diversity of writers. The mention of "brick," verse 14, evidently prepares the way for the account in chapter v. of the tasks demanded of them in making bricks (associated v. 4, 5 with "burdens," as "burdens" i. 11 with "bricks" verse 14), which binds this passage with that, and yet chapter v. is by the critics referred to the Jehovist. So that Nöldeke thought it necessary to strike out **וּבִלְכְּנִים** "and in brick" or perhaps **בַּחֲמֶר וּבִלְכְּנִים** "in mortar and in brick," as not belonging to i. 14 in its original form, but introduced by the Redactor. Wellhausen even thinks it advisable to expunge the entire latter part of the first clause, and then to transpose the remainder with the second clause, which is closely related in its expressions to the preceding verse, so that the text thus doctored will read, "And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigor: all the service wherein they made them serve was with rigor; and they made their lives bitter with hard bondage." In regard to which we can only say that if the critics are allowed to remodel the text at their pleasure and erase whatever stands in their way, they can probably prove any point that they wish to prove.

Knobel points out two expressions in verses 13, 14, which he says are Elohistie, viz., **פָּרֹךְ** *rigor* and **עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה** *hard bondage*. The former, which occurs twice here, is found in but one other passage in the Pentateuch, where it is three times repeated, Lev. xxiii. 43, 46, 53, and is probably employed with definite reference to the passage before us. "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor," carries with it the thought, thou shalt not deal oppressively with him as Egypt did with Israel. Besides this the word is used but once in the entire Bible, viz., in Ezek. xxxiv. 4, where the AV. has "cruelty," but the Revision "rigor." The whole mind of this prophet was steeped in the earlier Scriptures, and he often revives the obsolete expressions of the Mosaic law. It is obvious that so rare a word as this is no criterion of style. If it is found in but two Elohistie sections in the Pentateuch and is absent from every other section by the same author, it is not surprising that it should not occur in the Jehovist sections, seeing that the writer found no occasion for its employment. The other expression **עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה** is found but twice besides in the Pentateuch, in Exod. vi. 9, where it is also referred to the Elohist, and in Deut. xxvi. 6, where the critics refer it to an entirely distinct writer, the Deuteronomist. We, on the contrary, refer it to the same writer every time, whom we believe to be no other than Moses himself. Nöldeke compares "they made their lives bitter" **וַיַּמְרְרוּ אֶת־חַיֵּיהֶם** verse 14 with **מַרְתַּ רוּחַ** "bitterness of spirit" or grief of spirit in Gen. xxvi. 35, an Elohistie passage; but a much more analogous expression is **וַיַּמְרְרוּהוּ** "they made it bitter for him," Gen. xlix. 23, a Jehovist passage, as the critics reckon it, and the only other place in the Pentateuch in which the peculiar form of the verb is used which is here employed.

HEBRAICA.

I pass now to the next passage which is assigned to the Elohist II. 23b-25. Here I remark that by lopping away the first clause of verse 23, this passage is made to begin in the middle of a sentence. The fact that this is capable of being attached to I. 14 and yet make good sense does not prove this to have been its original connection. It might with an equally good result be joined to the first clause of verse 11, which the critics say belonged to an entirely different document. The scene at the burning bush in chapter III., though attributed by the critics to the Jehovist, is filled with allusions to these verses. "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob," III. 6, corresponds with the mention, II. 24, of God's "covenant with Abraham, with Isaac and with Jacob." Jehovah says (III. 7), "I have seen," and "have heard," and "I know," which corresponds precisely with "God heard" (verse 24), "God saw" and "God knew" (verse 25) (AV. "looked upon" and "had respect unto," verse 25). "The cry (צִעָקָה) of the children of Israel is come (בָּא) unto me" (III. 9) corresponds in thought, if not in exact verbal expression, with "they cried (וַיִּצְעֲקוּ), and their cry came up (וַתַּעַל) unto God" (II. 23). Such a number of coincidences could not occur in totally independent documents, but they are altogether natural in contiguous paragraphs by the same writer.

These verses have their root likewise in what is recorded in the Book of Genesis. The "covenant with Abraham" (verse 24) plainly refers back to Gen. XVII. (but see also XV. 18 of the Jehovist). The covenant with Jacob may refer to Gen. XXXV. 9 seq., also an Elohim passage, though one might more naturally think of Gen. XXVIII. 13 seq., which is Jehovistic. But there is absolutely no covenant with Isaac mentioned in any Elohim section, for it is plain that Gen. XXV. 11, to which Kayser appeals (p. 37, note) cannot be so considered. The only covenant with Isaac is that recorded Gen. XXVI. 2 seq., 24 seq., and these passages are Jehovistic. So that according to the division made by the critics, we have here an Elohist paragraph in Exod. II. 24 referring back to something recorded in the Jehovist document, which is inconsistent with any form of the divisive hypothesis ever yet proposed. Knobel cites two words in these verses as belonging to the diction of the Elohist. The first is נִאֲקָה, a rare word, which is found but once besides in the Pentateuch, Exod. VI. 5, where it is used with direct reference to this place, and which therefore can give no criterion of a writer's habitual style. The second is זָכַר *remember*, said of God. God is several times spoken of as remembering in Elohist passages, e. g., Gen. VIII. 1; IX. 15, 16; XIX. 29; Exod. VI. 5; Lev. XXVI. 42, 45. But that it is not peculiar to the Elohist is plain from Gen. XXX. 22, which Knobel is alone in referring to him; (Hupfeld, Nöldeke, Kayser, Schrader, Dillmann ascribe it to a different document); as well as from Exod. XXXII. 13, which is universally attributed to the Jehovist.

It can scarcely be said that the separatist hypothesis has a very strong foothold in the alleged Elohist passages of the first two chapters. Let us turn now to

the remaining sections of these chapters. Here an account is given of the cruel edict of the king of Egypt directing that every Hebrew child should be put to death, which Knobel considers utterly improbable, and numbers this among the reasons why this must have been written by the romancing Jehovist. It further records the infancy of Moses, the peril to which he was exposed, his being found and taken in charge by Pharaoh's daughter, his fleeing to Midian and his abode there, where he married the daughter of the priest of Midian. Of all this it is said that the Elohist knows nothing whatever.

In fact, the critics tell us, the account which is given of the parentage of Moses in II. 1 is at variance with that given elsewhere by the Elohist; so that this must be taken from quite a different document (so Dillmann). According to II. 1 the father and mother of Moses are unnamed persons of whom nothing further is known than that they belonged to the tribe of Levi. But the Elohist in Exod. VI. 20 and again in Num. XXVI. 58, 59 not only gives the names of both the father and mother of Moses, Amram and Jochebed, but says that the former was the grandson and the latter the own daughter of Levi. This, it is said, is quite a different representation from the other, and implies that the account in Exod. II. cannot be from the Elohist. With this I. 15-22 is indissolubly connected, because it is necessary to explain the circumstances under which Moses was born and the perils to which he was subjected in his infancy. Now, as Elohim is the name of God used in this paragraph (I. 17, 20, 21), it cannot be from the Jehovist, but by the other Elohist, and this, it is said, is confirmed by its peculiar diction. Dillmann notes four words that occur here as characteristic of the second Elohist יִלֵּךְ I. 17 seq.; II. 3, 6-10; רָעָה II. 4; אִמָּה II. 5; כֹּה in the sense of *here*, II. 12; two of these, יִלֵּךְ and רָעָה, Knobel adduces with equal confidence as characteristic of the Jehovist. So that the proof from diction of diversity of authorship rests on very slender grounds. And the alleged contrariety as to Moses' parentage is of no force, for it amounts simply to this, that their names are not mentioned when they are first referred to, but afterwards they are. The Amram who was Moses' father was not Levi's grandson, and Jochebed was not Levi's own daughter, any more than when Jesus Christ is called the son of David, or a Jew at the present day is called the child of Abraham, we are to understand that immediate offspring is intended in either case. And the argument for diversity of authorship in I. 6, 8-12 is just as flimsy. We have seen already that I. 13, 14 is not superfluous beside I. 11, 12, and that there is no diversity of view to preclude their proceeding from a common source. And the only additional consideration that verses 8-12 betray an intimate knowledge of Egyptian affairs is of no force, unless it can be shown that the Elohist was deficient in this respect. If, however, without demanding further proof we assent to the partition of chaps. I. and II., and allow the assumption of a different writer from the one first considered, the disagreements and the difficulties of the critics in maintaining their hypothesis have only begun.

After the Elohist verses, which have been already reviewed, are sundered from these chapters, Knobel assigns all the rest to the Jehovist, finding abundant indications of his diction and style in verses which others impute to the second Elohist, and even claiming as Jehovistic criteria what other critics class as criteria of a distinct writer. He also counts it among the Jehovist's characteristics that etymologies are given (II. 10) of the name Moses and (II. 22) of Gershom; that the names of the midwives (I. 15) are given, an exaggerated statement made of the numbers of the Hebrews (I. 9), improbable commands attributed to the king (I. 16, 22), while the fact that Moses' father-in-law in II. 18 is called Reuel and in III. 1 Jethro does not prevent his assigning both these passages to the Jehovist. How weak these arguments are in the esteem of other critics appears from the fact that in spite of them, they assign the greater portion of this passage not to the Jehovist, but to a different writer, the second Elohist.

Further, while Knobel attributes this passage to the Jehovist and finds abundant indications of his style and diction, he nevertheless discovers many peculiar expressions which he can only explain by assuming that the Jehovist has here drawn his materials from pre-existing documents which contained special accounts of Israel's condition in Egypt, and that he has imported these peculiarities from them. It ought here to be observed how this building hypothesis upon hypothesis weakens instead of strengthening the cause which requires to be supported in this manner. One of the grounds on which we are asked to believe in the existence of these hypothetical writers is that the sections assigned to each respectively have their own peculiar diction and style. But here the section assigned to the Jehovist departs so seriously from what is alleged to be his ordinary style that he must be supposed to be borrowing from some other treatise.

The section assigned by Knobel to the Jehovist is by Schrader and Dillmann parcelled between the second Elohist and the Jehovist, called by Dillmann B and C and by Schrader the Theocratic and the Prophetic narrators; to the former as far as II. 14, to the latter from II. 15 onward the flight into Midian and Moses' residence there. In the section attributed to the second Elohist, however, Dillmann finds several words and expressions which are commonly regarded as characteristic of the Jehovist. He infers from this that the Jehovist document must have contained an account of the very same matters as are found in this paragraph taken from the second Elohist, and that the Redactor, who is always ready on an emergency, while copying mainly from the one document, introduced a few words here and there from the other.

Moreover, while the visit to Midian and Moses' marriage there (II. 15-23a) is taken from the Jehovist document, the second Elohist must have recorded the very same facts. This is shown by his repeated allusions to them (III. 1 seq.; IV. 18; XVIII. 1 seq.). It seems, therefore, that the writer of I. 8-12, 15-II. 14 must have narrated substantially what is found in II. 15-23a; and the writer of II. 15-

23a must have narrated substantially what is found in the preceding section. This is certainly adapted to awaken the suspicion that the critics have sundered what belongs together; that the missing sections are purely imaginary, and that these successive paragraphs have emanated from one and the same writer.

The reasons adduced to show that II. 15 seq. are by a different writer from the preceding verses, seem to have very little stringency. Thus Schrader says that II. 14 suggests one motive for Moses' flight and verse 15 another. According to the former Moses was afraid because his killing the Egyptian had become publicly known. According to the latter he fled because Pharaoh sought to slay him. But these reasons are not only perfectly consistent, but really identical. The reason that Moses feared the publicity of his act was lest it should come to the ears of Pharaoh. Dillmann accordingly dismisses this as of no weight whatever; and he makes no account of the occurrence of גֵּרִישׁ II. 17, which Knobel claims as Jehovistic, but which occurs, Gen. XXI. 10, in a passage assigned to the second Elohist. He lays all the stress upon the fact that Moses' father-in-law is in successive paragraphs called by different names, Reuel in II. 18, Jethro in III. 1, holding that this is clear evidence of distinct writers. Knobel, as we have seen, does not regard this as decisive. He thinks the same writer used them both. And in fact there is no difficulty in this assumption, for while "Reuel" was his name, properly speaking, "Jethro" was his official title, meaning as it does "his Excellency;" so that the alternation is just as natural as though some one were to speak of President Cleveland, and then immediately after refer to him as "his Excellency."

Further, the alleged Jehovah verses II. 15-22 are most intimately related both with what precedes and with what follows, although Dillmann refers these to a different writer. The flight to Midian related by the Jehovist is in consequence of his killing the Egyptian which is related by the second Elohist. So too his keeping the flocks of his father-in-law, as told by the Jehovist, is pre-supposed in the account of God's manifestation to him in the bush at Horeb given by the second Elohist. All forms part of one continuous narrative, every portion of which is essential to the understanding of the rest.

The identity of the expressions in II. 22 (Jehovist), and XVIII. 3 (second Elohist) explaining why Moses called his son's name Gershon, "for he said, I have been a stranger in a strange land," shows plainly that these verses have not been independently conceived. And the occurrence (II. 16) in a Jehovist connection of the rare word רֶהֱטִים *troughs* elsewhere used by the second Elohist (Gen. XXX. 38, 41) leads Dillmann to infer that these verses, though taken by the Redactor from the Jehovist document, had been borrowed with some modifications by the Jehovist from the prior document of the second Elohist. According to Dillmann then we have in II. 15-23a a Jehovist paragraph interposed between two second Elohist paragraphs, forming parts of one closely connected narrative, no portion of which

is intelligible without the other; and there are clear indications beside that this Jehovist paragraph came originally from the second Elohist. And yet all this jumble of different writers is assumed on the sole ground that Reuel is called by his proper name (II. 18), and by his title Jethro, or his Excellency (III. 1). And when in addition to all this we find the Jehovist in IV. 19 referring back to this narrative, and are told that both the Jehovist and the second Elohist must have given complete and similar accounts of this whole matter, the suspicion very naturally arises that perhaps the Jehovist and second Elohist may be the same person, notwithstanding all this mystification.

Wellhausen again deals with the non-Elohistic portion of the chapters before us in his own peculiar fashion. While he agrees with Knobel in referring it all to the Jehovist, he maintains that this Jehovist document is itself composite, being made up of two prior sources, and thus is so far brought into accord with Dillmann and Schrader. The division which he actually makes, however, is quite distinct from theirs, and his nomenclature as well as his symbols are peculiar. His J, the Jahvist, corresponds to Dillmann's C, or what other critics call the Jehovist. His E, the Elohist, to Dillmann's B, or what other critics call the second Elohist.

He assigns to J I. 6, the words "were multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty" in verse 7; also verses 8-10, because of their general resemblance in style to Gen. XI. 6, 7. But verses 11, 12 are referred to E, because there is a different phrase for "taskmasters" in verse 11, שָׂרֵי מִסִּים from that which is used III. 7; V. 6, 10, 13, 14, נָגִישִׁים and because קָרַן to *loathe* is in verse 12 used in the peculiar sense of *being afraid of*. How little weight Dillmann and Schrader attach to these considerations and to the division which is built upon them, appears from their assigning verses 8-12 to the same writer variously denominated E or B or the second Elohist. And in the following paragraph which Dillmann and Schrader assign entire to the same writer, Wellhausen deviates so far as to sever 20b as disturbing the connection between 20a and 21, and attaching the former to verse 22. This he regards as merely a varied repetition of what had already been stated, verses 15-21, and consequently attributable not to E, but to J, which is further confirmed by the words (20b) "multiplied and waxed very mighty," which are identical with those which he attributes to J, in verse 7. And in fact, verse 7 furnishes the key-note of the entire chapter; it is the spring in which all that follows takes its rise, and there are repeated allusions to it and repetitions of its language in subsequent verses, 9, 10, 12, 20, thus binding all into unity and showing the critical attempts at partition to be wholly unfounded.

In I. 14 the words בַּחֲמֹר וּבִלְבָנִים וּבְכֹל עֲבָדָה בִּשְׂרָה are assigned to J in preparation for chapter V., and stand in contrast with a different conception by E, verse 11. But the Redactor could have seen no contrariety, or he would not have put them together in the same continuous narrative. And at any rate the arbitrary sundering of these words from their connection is but a shift to evade

the evidence which they furnish, that the paragraph in which they are found is from the same pen as chapter V., and a confession that this evidence cannot be set aside by any less violent method.

In chapter II. he makes a different partition from Schrader and Dillmann, assigning verses 1-10 to E, and verses 11-22 to J, thus recognizing the fact which they disregard, that verses 11-14 cannot be sundered from the verses that follow. While thus attributing the account of Moses' birth and infancy to E, and his residence in Midian to J, he nevertheless concludes that J and E alike must have recorded both, leaving us to wonder whether E's missing account of the life in Midian is not after all that which he has imputed to J, and whether J's missing story of Moses' birth is not that which he has ascribed to E, and whether the chapter is not one indivisible narrative, whose different portions are so necessary to each other that even after the critics have sundered it in two, they are straightway obliged to assume that each part had originally just such a complement as they have severed from it. Wellhausen, however, thinks it quite impossible that it could have been the same writer who said, verse 10, **וַיִּגְדַּל הַיֶּלֶד** "and the child was grown," and then immediately after in the next verse **וַיִּגְדַּל מֹשֶׁה** "and Moses was grown." This, however, did not disturb Dillmann and Schrader, and it need not disturb us. It requires but little experience to discover that the critics have an abundance of arguments which they can employ if they have any end to be answered by them; but to which they pay no attention if they do not suit their immediate purpose.

E's account of the infancy of Moses is, however, in Wellhausen's opinion full of inconsistencies and incongruities, which show that we have not the story in its primitive form, but that some later account has been intruded into it. According to II. 1, 2 "a man of the house of Levi took a wife and she conceived and bare a son;" from this he infers that Moses was the eldest child, and yet (verse 7) mention is made of an older sister. In verse 6 she saw the child **הַיֶּלֶד** and lo! a weeping boy **וַיֵּרָא**;—the two different terms applied to the infant could scarcely, he thinks, have come from one pen. Further in the same verse "she had compassion on him" is, as he conceives, strangely thrust in between clauses which belong together. "She saw the child....and said, This is one of the Hebrews' children." Again the name was presumably given to the child as soon as he was found, but (verse 10) it is postponed until after he was grown. Now while Wellhausen confesses that he cannot carry a division through upon this basis, he infers from the particulars just recited that there was another version of the story which has been mixed up with the account here given,—a version which knew nothing of the older sister or of the nursing by the mother, but simply said "lo! a weeping boy, and she had compassion on him (verse 6) and (verse 10) he became her son, and she called his name Moses, because she had drawn him out of the water."

It is needless to reply to such baseless conjectures ; only it does not say much for the intelligence of this supposititious writer E if he could unwittingly confuse together two such different accounts of the same transaction ; or if he saw the contrariety, it does not say much for his honesty, that he should have covered it up as he has done, until Wellhausen discovered the fraud. And further, if these contrarieties and improbabilities and varying diction can exist in a paragraph, which, Wellhausen confesses, all came from the pen of E, why must we conclude from the same sort of contrarieties, improbabilities and varying diction, which the critics fancy that they discover elsewhere, that there has been more than a single writer. The ingenious critic has simply exposed the weakness and fallacy of the critical arguments.

A similar confusion, though not to the same extent, is found by Wellhausen in the portion of chapter II., which he attributes to J, verses 11-22. Inconsistent reasons are given (verses 14, 15) for the flight of Moses ; and the last two clauses of verse 15 are not continuous—Moses' sitting down by the well must have preceded his dwelling in the land of Midian, though it is mentioned after it. The puzzle about the name of Moses' father-in-law he undertakes to solve by conjecturing that J mentioned no name in his account, that Jethro was inserted by the Jehovist, but that the Reuel of II. 18 cannot be the same with the Reuel (or Raguel) of Num. x. 29. The father of Hobab spoken of in the latter passage does not correspond with the priest with his seven daughters in the former.

The divisions made of chapters I., II. by the principal critics of the reigning schools have now been recited, together with the reasons on which they base these divisions. I think it can scarcely be said that they are very plausible, much less conclusive. So extensive a hypothesis cannot, it is true, be judged by the inspection of one brief passage. The grounds on which it professedly rests extend through the entire Pentateuch, and it is only after a full examination that we can pronounce finally and decisively upon its truth or its falsity. But we can at least say that, so far as we have seen in this specimen passage, there is not much to commend it to sober and judicious minds. It may be very ingenious, and may set forth a long array of arguments. But we have found no proof that it is true.

THE LAW OF INHERITANCE IN ANCIENT BABYLONIA.

BY THEO. G. PINCHES,

British Museum, London, England.

In the study of the manners and customs of the ancient nations who of old inhabited the plains of Mesopotamia lies a charm seldom to be found either in their history (which is often dry and uninteresting where it does not throw light upon facts already known to us from the Bible or from the classical authors), or in the philology of their languages, important and deeply interesting as it is. This great charm probably arises from the fact that we get all our information at first hand—from the documents left by the people themselves, enabling us to see them as they were, not as others saw them. The material is plentiful, and it is therefore our own fault if the idea which we get be imperfect or malformed. Time, and much time, will be needed to enable us to understand thoroughly what they have to tell us about themselves; but in the end, by patient research, we may hope to succeed in the work to the very fullest. A beginning has been made, and, no doubt, scholars will add to what we know as time goes on.

The text to which I now draw attention is a legal document of an exceedingly interesting nature, on account of the light it sheds in the direction above indicated. The principal part was obtained by Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward in Mesopotamia, whilst conducting the Wolfe expedition; and it forms part, therefore, of the very valuable collection of tablets brought home by the talented explorer. Prof. Ward was so kind as to allow me to copy this document during his stay in London in June, 1885; and owing to this, I was able, shortly after, to identify a fragment acquired by the British Museum (with a number of other Babylonian antiquities) on the 30th of April, 1885, as a part of this very tablet, adding considerably to the text. The American fragment has twenty-one lines, six of them being imperfect, and gives the beginning of the obverse and the end of the reverse. The English fragment has sixteen lines, all imperfect at the ends, but almost completing the obverse. The tablet probably contained, when perfect, about fifty lines, of which thirty-three remain. Of the wanting lines, about fourteen probably belonged to the text proper, the remainder being the names of the witnesses.

The text refers to an application made by Bêl-kašir to his father Nadinu, to be allowed to adopt Bêl-ukîn, son of his wife Zunnâ by a former husband, as his own son. Nadinu objects on the ground that the property of the family ought to go to his own second son, who, failing heirs lawfully begotten by Bêl-kašir, was the one really entitled to it. As the end of the text is lost, we cannot tell what was the result of the application, but it probably ended either in a refusal on the part

of Nadinu, or else in a compromise. The document is dated at Babylon, the 15th day of Sebat, in the 9th year of Nabonidus king of Babylon (546 B. C.). Most of the witnesses of the transaction were members of the family of Saggillâa, the family to which Nadinu and his son belonged. This interesting text therefore presents us with a picture of a kind of family gathering, before which the son makes his application, and the father gives his answer, and which could, most likely, make an expression of its opinion upon the merits or demerits of the case. This custom of getting the members of the family to attend as witnesses in family matters was not uncommon in Babylonia,¹ and probably helped greatly the just settlement of all questions affecting individual members.

On the following two pages is reproduced the text of this very interesting tablet. The portion belonging to the British Museum is that below line 11 on the obverse, and above line 5 on the reverse, the crack extending downwards to line 15 of the former, and upwards to line 3 of the latter.² The registration number of the British Museum fragment is 85-4-30, 48.

¹ See *The Guide to the Nimroud Central Saloon*, p. 104 (No. 70).

² Babylonian tablets turn over top and bottom, not sidewise, as do our books.

20. 一用五倍子血散五血散一用五倍子

27. 以全書之史而論之可謂善其用矣

22. 五粒五子入金日自美日五子平 五子

23. 平利人張廷甲，自乾隆末年，自發而

以正其心而正其身

25. 金史卷之五十五 世宗本紀第五

26. 五陰所攝 金銀珠寶 草木 土石 草木

27.

皇朝文獻通考

Reverse

上 面 一 百 四 十 五 個 字

8. 日一書立百六十八 女密無廢無女自今

9. 永無參一州 解下 全 全 終 續















TRANSLITERATION AND LITERAL TRANSLATION.

OBVERSE.

1. ∇ Bêl-kašir, abli-šu ša ∇ Nadinu, abil ∇ Saggillâa
 Bêl-kašir, his son who (is) Nadinu, son of Saggillâa
2. ana ∇ Nadinu, âbi-šu, abli-šu ša ∇ Zērîa, abil ∇ Saggillâa
 to Nadinu, his father, his son who (is) Zērîa, son of Saggillâa
3. ikbî umma: "Ana Bît-turnî tašpuranni-ma ✕ Zunnā
 said thus: "To Bît-turnî thou sentest me and Zunnā
4. âššati âhuz-ma mârâ u mârta lâ tâldu. ∇ Bêl-ukîn,
 as wife I took and son and daughter she bore not. Bêl-ukîn,
5. mâri-šu ša ✕ Zunnā, mâr âššatîa, ša lapanî
 her son who (is) Zunnā, son of my wife, whom formerly
6. ∇ Nikūdu, abil ∇ Nûr-Sin, muti-šu mahrû
 (to) Nikūdu, son of Nûr-Sin, her husband former
7. tûlidu, ana mârûti lûlkê-ma
 she had borne, to sonship let me take and
8. lû mârûa šû; ina IM-DUB mârûti-šu
 let be my son he; on a tablet his sonship
9. tîšab-ma êškêti-ni û mimmu-ni
 set and our incomes and our property
10. malâ bašû kunuk-ma pani-šu šudgil-ma
 as much as there is, seal, and unto him bequeath and
11. lû mâr šabit kâti-ni šû." ∇ Nadinu âmat
 let the son taken by our hands be he." Nadinu the word
12. ∇ Bêl-kašir, mâri-šu, ikbûšu lâ imgur; ∇ Nadinu
 Bêl-kašir, his son, had said to him did not please; Nadinu
13. "ana ûmu rûkûtu manma šanâmma ana lâ lakê
 "for days distant anyone other (is) not to take

14. êskēti ū NIG-LAG -šunutu" duppi ištur-ma
incomes and property their" (on) a tablet he had written and
15. kâta ¶ Bêl-kašir, mâri-šu, irkus-ma ina libbi ušêdî
the hands of Bêl-kašir, his son, he had bound and in the midst had made [known]
16. umma: "Umu ¶ Nadinu ana šimtum italku-ma
thus: "The day Nadinu to (his) fate goes and
17. arki-šu mâr šît libbi ša ¶ Bêl-kašir, mâri-šu,
after him a son proceeding from the heart of Bêl-kašir, his son,
18. ittamladu êskēti ū NIG-LAG-MEŠ
is born, the incomes and properties
19. ša ¶ Nadinu, âbi-šu, ilikkî; kî mâr šît lib[bi]
of Nadinu, his father, he shall take; if a son proceeding from the heart
20. ¶ Bêl-kašir lâ ittamladu, ¶ Bêl-kašir
of Bêl-kašir is not born, Bêl-kašir
21. âḥi-šu ū bēl-zitti-šu ana mârūtu ilikkê[-ma]
his brother and the lord of his property to sonship shall take and
22. êskēti-šu ū NIG-LAG-MEŠ ša ¶ Nadinu âbi[-šu]
his incomes and the properties of Nadinu his father
23. pani-šu iddagal ¶ Bêl-kašir manma šanam[ma]
unto him shall bequeath, Bêl-kašir anyone other
24. ana mârūtu ūl ilikkā'; allik âḥi[-šu]
to sonship shall not take; but his brother
25. [û] bēl zitti-šu ana mârūtu ana muḥ[ḥi]
[and] the lord of his property to sonship concerning
26. [êskēti] ū NIG-LAG-MEŠ ša ¶ Nadi[nu.....]
[the incomes] and properties which Nadinu [has bequeathed]
27. [..... ¶ Bêl-ka]šir mimma(?)
[he shall take. Bêl-ka]šir anything(?)

REVERSE.

1. Pân.....
Before.....
2.
3.
4. [abil  Saggil]lâa
N., his son, who is N., son of Saggillâa
5.  Nergal-.....[abil  Sag]gillâa
Nergal-, his son, who is N., son of Saggillâa
6.  Lâbaši, abli-šu ša  Dumuk, abil  Saggillâa
Lâbaši, his son, who (is) Dumuk, son of Saggillâa
7.  Rittu,   Marduk-bêl-irbâ, abli-šu ša  Šulâ,
Scribe, Merodach-bêl-irbâ, his son, who (is) Šulâ,
8. abil  Ūṣur-âmat- Bêl. Tin-tir ki, âraḥ Šabaṭi, ūmu ḥamiššerit,
son of Ūṣur-âmat- Bêl. Babylon, month Sebat, day fifteenth
9. šattu tišît,  Nabû-na'id, šar Tin-tir ki
year ninth, Nabonidus, king of Babylon.

FREE TRANSLATION.

OBVERSE.

"Bêl-kašir, son of Nadinu, son of Saggillâa, spoke to Nadinu, his father, son of Zērîa, son of Saggillâa, thus: 'Thou sentest me to Bît-turnî, and I took Zunnâ as my wife, but she has not borne son or daughter. Let me adopt Bêl-ukîn, son of Zunnâ, child of my wife, whom she bore some time ago to Nîkudu, son of Nûr-Sin, her former husband, and let him be my son; record his adoption on a tablet, and seal and bequeath to him our revenues and our property, all there is, and let him be the child taken by our hands.' Nadinu was not pleased by the words which Bêl-kašir, his son, had said to him. Nadinu had written on a tablet, 'No one whatever, at a future time, is to take their revenue or property;' he had bound the hands of Bêl-kašir, his son, and had stated it in the deed thus: 'When Nadinu goes to his fate, then after him the son proceeding from the loins of Bêl-kašir his son, who shall be born, shall take the incomes and properties of Nadinu his father. If a son proceeding from the loins of Bêl-kašir be not born, Bêl-kašir

shall adopt his brother and rightful heir, and shall bequeath unto him the revenues and properties of Nadinu his father. Bêl-kašir shall not adopt any other whatever, but he shall adopt his brother and rightful heir on account of the revenues and properties which Nadinu [has bequeathed to him]....."

REVERSE.

"[Before.....

[N., son of N., son of Saggil]lâa;

[Nergal-..., son of N., son of Sag]gillâa;

Lâbâsi, son of Dumuk, son of Saggillâa.

Scribe: Marduk-bêl-irbâ, son of Šulâ, son of Ūšur-âmat-Bêl. Babylon, month Sebat, fifteenth day, year ninth, Nabonidus king of Babylon."

NOTES ON THE WORDS, ETC.

OBVERSE.

1. Bêl-kašir, "Bêl binds up." Nadinu, "He who gives" (most likely an abbreviated name). Saggillâa, a corruption of E-sagilâa, "the Ê-sagilite," that is, one employed at the temple called Ê-sagila, in Babylon.

3. Bît-turnî, "house of Turnî." The third character (ni) is doubtful, as there may be only, in reality, one upright wedge, instead of two, intended. If this be the case, we must read Bît-mâr-banî, "the house of the born son," probably the place where official deeds or declarations of "born-sonship" (mâr-banûtu, a privilege conferred on slaves) were drawn up, or where such slaves as possessed that privilege were registered. For translations of tablets relating to this privilege, see the "Guide to the Nimroud Central Saloon," pp. 94 and 96.

4. tûl du. 3d pers. fem. Kal of âlâ du, "to bear," Heb. לָדָּ. Bêl-ukîn, "Bêl has established."

5. lapanî, Heb. לִפְנֵי. In Assyrian not only "before," but also "formerly," "at a former time," as here.

6. Nîkûdu, Heb. נִקּוּדָּא (Friedrich Delitzsch, "Prolegomena," p. 212). Nûr-Sin, "light of the moon-god," or "a light is the moon-god." mut u, "husband," cf. Heb. מְתִים, "men."

7. ana mârûti lakû, "to take to sonship" = "to adopt;" mârûtu, abstract from mâr u, "son" (f. mâr tu); lûlkê, 1st pers. Precative Kal of lak u or lēkû, Heb. לָקַח.

8. IM DUB, the usual group indicating a sealed tablet. The Semitic transcription is doubtful, but is probably kang u, from the root kanāku, "to seal," (cf. WAI., V., pl. 32, l. 19 abc. By carelessness on the part of the lithographer, kan is printed as i in both lines 18 and 19).

9. tîšab, a very uncommon form, which seems to be the Aorist Kal, 2d pers. sing., with î for û in the first syllable, from âsābu, "to sit;" but which

is probably (judging from its transitive force, and from its being accompanied by the Imperative *kunuk*, line 10) Imperative from a Tiphel conjugation of the same form. Compare the Arabic 5th and 6th forms. *êskēti*, plural of *êsku*, "a (periodical) gift," generally expressed, as here, by the group *giš-šub-ba*.

10. *kunuk*, Imperative Kal of *kanāku*, "to seal," whence *kangu* (for *kanku*), etc. *šudgil*, Imperative Shuphul (IV. 1) of *dagāl*, "to look," then "to look to," "to trust," Shuphul "to entrust to," "bequeath."

11. *kâtîni*, "our hands." The dual is not to be read here, as the phonetic complement *i* shows. The two short upright wedges merely show that the character *šu* has here its common meaning of "hand."

12. *manma šanâmma ana lâ lakê*, "any other is not to take," "no other whatever is to take," or "by no other whatever is to be taken." *šanâmma*, Accusative of *šanû*, "other" with suffixed *-ma*. *ana lâ lakê*, "not to take," also "not to be taken;" a not uncommon idiom.

14. *NIG-LAG*, lit., "what (= that which) is a gift." *nig* (Akk.) = *mimma*, "something," "anything;" and *lag* = *kurbannu*, "a gift" (cf. Heb. קָרְבָּן). The Akkadian *nig* was also weakened to *ni*, *ig*, or *i*, the first and the last being the forms most suited to make compounds, so that the accepted Akkadian reading was probably *nilag* or *ilag*. As, in Babylonian texts, we sometimes find the group *nig-lag* followed by the character *ku*, it is not unlikely that the word was borrowed by them under the form of *nîlakku* or *îlakku*. The plural (l. 18) should most likely be (n)îlakkâti.



16. *ittalku*, Pres. or Aor. of the secondary form of the Kal of *âlāku* "to go" (*ittalku* for *i'talku*). "To go to one's fate" = "to die."

18. *ittamladu* (pronounce *ittawladu*, with consonantal *w*, not with the diphthong *aw*), secondary form of the Niphal of *âlādu* ('*alādu* = *walādu*), Heb. יָלַד.

19. *ilikkî*, Pres. or Fut. Kal of *lakû* (see the note to line 7. This form is given as *ilikkê* at the end of line 21, where, however, it was probably followed by *-ma*).

21. *zîtti* (pl. *zînâte*), noun from the root *zânu*. Cf. Arab. زَان, "to ornament," زَيْن, "to decorate" (houses or walls, with carpet, etc.). Hence, apparently, the Assyrian meaning of "property" for the noun *zîttu*.

REVERSE.

8. *Ûsur-âmat-Bêl*, "Keep the command of Bêl." The characters   may, however, be read as one of the names of the god Hea (Ea or Ae) in which case his name must be substituted for that of Bêl.

NOTES ON THE USE OF THE HEBREW TENSES.

BY WILLIAM HENRY BENNETT,

Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, England.

II.

HEBREW AND ENGLISH.

Our great debt to German Hebrew scholars is not without its disadvantages. Its necessary indirectness is a misfortune. Our English hand-books, even when not translations or editions of German works, have something of the character of an adaptation, for the use of English students, of an exposition of the theory of Hebrew Syntax prepared for German students, and such an adaptation, however scientifically correct, is apt to lack force and clearness.

German, too, is not the most desirable medium through which to study Hebrew. It is massive, and perhaps somewhat rigid, whereas Hebrew is elastic. For instance, German rejoices in polysyllabic compounds, and Hebrew, except in proper names, has no compounds at all; nor is there anything in the use of the Hebrew verb parallel to the German custom of accumulating auxiliaries at the end of a sentence.

Perhaps, however, the disadvantages of studying Hebrew through German are rather negative than positive. It is not so much that we are misled by Germanisms as that we lose the analogies furnished by our own language, and authorities are not careful to express themselves according to the terms of modern English grammar. They seem to think that modern Hebrew Syntax may be expressed by English Syntax of the times when English was chiefly looked upon as a vehicle for translations of Greek and Latin, and its tenses named after the Greek and Latin tenses they most frequently translated.

Driver, indeed, furnishes us with a beginning of better things; but even here there seems room for improvement under this head.

For instance, he emphasizes (p. 2) the distinction between *order* and *kind* of time, and states (p. 4) that as regards *kind* of time we are by no means sensitive. Now Dr. R. Morris, in his English Grammar (p. 54), having given as the three tenses Past, Present and Future, adds that each tense has four forms, according to the state of the action, viz., Indefinite, Progressive or Imperfect, Completed or Perfect, Perfect and Progressive. This state of the action corresponds to Driver's kind of time. Is it fair to say of a language that expresses kind of time so fully that it is by no means sensitive as regards this quality. True, authors who constructed English Syntax on the basis of Latin grammar, may have lacked sensitiveness in this particular; but then Hebrew grammars are still in use which speak chiefly of the Past and Future.

It follows from this ignoring of the terms of modern English Syntax that the terms "present," "perfect," "imperfect," etc., are used without any closer definition, and vagueness and ambiguity are introduced, where clearness would have been gained by using the double terms which express both order and kind of time, e. g., Present Perfect.

We may first notice that in English in its present form, as in Hebrew, we have only two tense forms obtained by inflection, the Present Indefinite and Past Indefinite. Moreover, the Subjunctive form is now, except in the first and second person singular, identical with the form of the Present Indefinite, just as in Hebrew the same form is used for the Imperfect and for the Jussive. Hence, as Driver (p. 74) points out, there is an ambiguity in English between the Indicative and Subjunctive which serves to illustrate that in Hebrew between the Imperfect and the Jussive. This same coincidence of form between the Indicative and Subjunctive illustrates Driver's contention (pp. 95, 96) that the coincidence of form in the Jussive and the Imperfect with Waw Cons. is accidental. We see that in English the Indicative Present Plural "berath" and the Present Subjunctive "beren" give us in modern English one form, "bear," for both Indicative and Subjunctive (Morris' Historical Outlines of English Accidence, pp. 173, 174), just as, according to Driver, in Hebrew the Imperfect after Waw Cons. and the Jussive arrive at the same form through independent processes of development and not through connection in sense.

We pass on to the

USES OF THE PERFECT.

In a previous note we implied that the English Perfect might approximately be held to include the uses of the Hebrew Perfect, as regards the Past, Perfect and Pluperfect, the Hebrew Perfect of affirmation and the Hebrew Perfect used as a Present.

Now Davidson's general table of the uses of the Perfect (p. 51) is as follows:

a. The Aorist (Past)	<i>he killed</i>
b. The Perfect	<i>he has killed</i>
c. The Pluperfect	<i>he had killed</i>
d. The Future Perfect	<i>he shall have killed</i>

Here we may notice that Davidson does not feel it necessary to include in his general sketch the uses of the Perfect as a Present or Future Indefinite.

Again the forms in *b*, *c*, *d* are the three tenses of the English Perfect, thus,

<i>he has killed</i>	Present Perfect
<i>he had killed</i>	Past Perfect
<i>he shall have killed</i>	Future Perfect

Hence it appears that in English this *kind* or *state* of time is fully recognized, and that English grammars include under the English Perfect just those forms which are given in Hebrew grammars as the English equivalents of the Hebrew

Perfect. Herein at least English grammar seems fully sensitive to kind of time. Also under this head we may notice another point. The student as he reads such a sketch as Davidson's is struck with the fact that one Hebrew form may have so many English equivalents, and mentally notes it as a characteristic difficulty of the Hebrew language. The tone of most hand-books on the subject tends to foster this feeling, and doubtless the feeling is largely true. But similar characteristics exist in English, and the difficulty is one of degree rather than of kind.

For instance, in English the form of the Present Perfect, *he has killed*, is used as Aorist, Perfect and Future Perfect.

The best illustration of the use of the Present Perfect for an Aorist or Indefinite Past is perhaps given by those cases in which English idiom compels us to translate a Greek Aorist by a Present Perfect. For instance, in Luke xiv. 18 ἀγρόν ἡγόρασα, etc., the sense is plainly that of an Aorist, and yet it is scarcely possible to translate in English "I bought a field and therefore I cannot come;" we say rather "I have bought, etc." (Moulton's Translation of Winer, p. 345.)

The use as Perfect or Present Perfect is, of course, the ordinary way.

The Present Perfect form is commonly used for the Future Perfect in such sentences as: "If he has finished his work when you see him, ask him to come here;" which is equivalent to "If he shall have finished, etc."

Even the rarer uses of the Hebrew Perfect have some parallels in those of the English Present Perfect. Take, for instance, Davidson's example of the Perfect of Experience, Ps. lxxxiv. 4, "The swallow finds מְצֵאָה a home," the English Version "hath found" equally expresses a general truth of experience, just as "Nature has provided birds with wings" is as good English as "Nature provides birds with wings."

In the case of stative verbs and verbs like יָדַע it might perhaps be as accurate to say that English uses a Present Indefinite for a Present Perfect, as to say that Hebrew uses the Present Perfect as Indefinite. "I know" = "I have learnt;" "I am old" = "I have become old," and so with many other such words.

Again, in the case of the Prophetic Perfect and Perfect of Strong Affirmation, it is not that a Past tense or Perfect form is used for a Future tense or Imperfect form; but the speaker, as in the case of Ephron the Hittite, wishes to represent the Future or Imperfect as Past or Perfect, and so uses the Past or Perfect, intending it to carry its own meaning. The English student feels the propriety of the Perfect, and feels an English Present Perfect, though not idiomatic, would be perfectly intelligible, and that "I have given" for נָתַתִּי would be a fair equivalent for the English expression used in such cases "It is yours already."

We obtain similar results from examining

THE USES OF THE IMPERFECTS.

Davidson's sketch (p. 54) is as follows:

- a. The Present, *he kills* (especially of general truths).
- b. The Imperfect, *he killed* (particularly of repeated past acts).
- c. The Future, *he will kill*.
- d. The Potential, *he may or can, might, could, would, etc., kill*.

It is true that the usages thus given as belonging to the Imperfect "kind of time" do not cover the same area as those of any one English "state of the action;" but curiously enough they have most in common with some of the usages of the forms of the English Indefinite.

Thus the English forms under *a*, *b*, and *c*, are those of the English Present, Past and Future Indefinite respectively. The English Present Indefinite is commonly used of general truths, and we find the Past Indefinite for repeated actions thus: "He got up at six every morning."

Here again many of the meanings included in this group may be expressed by one English form, either the Present Indefinite or the Future Indefinite.

The Present Indefinite is used of course of the present, very commonly of general truths; it is used of past actions whether single or frequentative, as the Historical Present; it is also used of the Future in such sentences as: "Next year my brother comes home." It has already been pointed out that a form sometimes similar to, sometimes identical with the Indicative Present Indefinite is used as a Subjunctive, which would cover some of the uses of *d*. This last resemblance is, however, accidental.

But on the other hand, the Future Indefinite is also used of general truths, and even of a single fact, as: "This will be your brother." It is true that in the latter case, as more or less in other cases of the Future, the usage is more or less due to the influence of the meaning of "will" as an auxiliary; but this does not alter the fact that the same *form* is used for these different senses. Again, of course, the Future Indefinite is used of the Future; and is in some cases equivalent to some of the Potential uses of the Hebrew Imperfect. It is even used of the Past where the main tense of a narrative is the Historical Present. Thus, in Byron's *Siege of Corinth*, stanza xxvi., the tenses are chiefly Historical Presents, but we have two lines:

"There is not a banner in Moslem war
Will lure the Delhis half so far."

It is true that this usage may be due to the writer placing himself at the point of view of the actors in his narrative; but then a similar explanation might plausibly account for many Hebrew Imperfects.

The use of the Hebrew Imperfect for repeated action in the past finds its parallel in English in the use of the auxiliary "would" (the past of the auxiliary "will") which is used for the future. So that, though the forms for the Future and what we might call the Frequentative Past are not the same in English (as they are in Hebrew), yet they are very closely connected. Thus we

claim that English Syntax is sensitive to and capable of fully expressing the Hebrew kinds of time Perfect and Imperfect; and also that the usages of English forms in different senses closely parallel similar usages of the Hebrew Perfect and Imperfect.

English also affords examples of frequent and rapid change of tense parallel to the changes from Perfect to Imperfect in Hebrew poetry. In English poetry the Historical Present and the Narrative Past alternate pretty frequently with one another.

TENSES OF JOSHUA XV.-XIX.

In reading these chapters we are struck by the frequent occurrence of series of Perfects with Waw, where we should have expected either simple Perfects or Imperfects with Waw.

These series occur in the descriptions of the boundaries of the several tribes. The most complete are those in ch. xv. and ch. xviii. 11, and which give the boundaries of Judah and Benjamin. The series in xvi. 1—xvii. 10 giving the boundaries of the sons of Joseph is more broken, and the account seems to have been curtailed. The accounts of the territories of Simeon and Dan are quite different in form, and consist almost entirely of lists of cities. In the cases of Zebulon, Issachar and Asher and Naphtali such tenses as occur are almost entirely Perfects with Waw, but the accounts consist chiefly of bare lists of names, and it is noticeable that in these four accounts two verbs, **שב** and **פגע**, are used freely, though in all the other accounts only **פגע** is found, and that only once in the case of the sons of Joseph.

This account of the division of the land is interrupted by historical episodes in which the usual narrative tenses, the simple Perfect and the Imperfect with Waw Cons., are used. Moreover, at the head of each account stands a verse or more in which narrative tenses occur, and some of the accounts conclude with a note as to the survival of the Canaanites, and here, too, narrative tenses are used. Sometimes a narrative tense, or tenses, will be found in close connection with these series of Perfects with Waw; here and there a simple Imperfect is found.

These series are chiefly made up of the verbs **עלה, ירד, יצא, הלך, היה, שבו, פגע, סבב, עבר**, variously repeated and combined; and an account often closes with the formula **והיו תצאותי**.¹

The reader feels at once that, as Driver says: "In the teeth of the constant usage in the preceding portion of the book, it is highly improbable that the Perfect and Waw should be a mere alternative for **ו**." However, in xv. 4 the clause **והיה לכם גבול נגב** suggests that these series do not properly

¹ The tenses in these chapters are dealt with by Driver at some length on pp. 172, 173; and the references to Driver in this note are to one or other of these pages.

belong to a narrative, but to an address or discourse; that all these tenses, difficult as they are in straightforward narrative, would be quite in place in the text of a decree or law settling the boundaries.

But Driver deprives us of any light or guidance which we might derive from לָכֵן, by setting it down as an undoubted error, arising from a copyist imagining the verb to express a command. He states that the context is entirely out of harmony with such a sense, points out that elsewhere the pronouns are all in the third person and appeals to the LXX. which reads *ἀντὶν*. The last consideration is not, perhaps, very weighty when we remember that the LXX. is not without a tendency to avoid difficulties by simplifying the text. As to the context, if the whole be narrative and the tenses frequentative, it might be very difficult to take this particular clause or passage as a command; but we shall venture to suggest a theory which would remove or account for this difficulty and possibly also for the solitary second person. It may be noticed as to this second person that there are very few personal pronouns in the clauses in which the Perfects with Waw occur.

One reason on which Driver specially dwells in maintaining that these tenses are frequentative is the occasional occurrence among them of Imperfects; it is obvious that these Imperfects would be perfectly in place if the tenses belonged to a command.

In opposition to this view of Driver we are inclined to follow the suggestion of the לָכֵן (or לָהֶם, if לָכֵן be a false reading of the copyist, who altered לָהֶם into לָכֵן), and to take these tenses as belonging to a command.

We may suppose that the author of the Book of Joshua had before him official documents containing the decrees fixing the boundaries of the tribes, that these decrees naturally ran in Perfects with Waw and Imperfects, "The boundary shall be, etc." The author selected such portions of these documents as were suitable for his purpose, and inserted them in his book, preserving them, possibly out of special reverence and desire for accuracy, in their original form. He found it convenient to append headings and notes, in which, as part of his own narrative, he used narrative tenses; and he may have used some device, such as spacing, where moderns would use inverted commas, to indicate that he was quoting the precise words of his authority. Origen's system of obelisks is a proof that marks within the text are not an exclusively modern idea. It is possible also that to the writer of the Book of Joshua it may have seemed so obvious that these tenses must belong to an address rather than to a narrative, that he may not have thought it necessary to guard against mistake by any mechanical device. That such mechanical device, if used, should be lost sight of and omitted is rendered extremely probable by the history of the text of the Septuagint in its relation to Origen's Hexapla, the double renderings of a single passage being due to the omission of marks which showed such renderings to be alternative.

We allege in support of this theory—

(1) It accounts simply and easily for the tenses in these sections, and explains why, for a few clauses at the beginning and end, and sometimes for what may be an explanatory note in the middle of an account of a tribe's boundaries, we should find narrative tenses, and elsewhere Imperfects and Perfects with Waw. Driver does not explain why, without any change of subject-matter, we change from initial narrative tenses to frequentative ones. Why should the writer always begin to describe a border with narrative tenses and drop off into frequentatives?

(2) This theory also offers us an explanation of the solitary second personal pronoun לָכֶם. In the first place, if we separate xv. 1, 2 and the last sentence of xv. 12 on the ground of the occurrence in them of narrative tenses, and confine ourselves to the verses containing the series of Perfects with Waw and Imperfects, this is the only personal pronoun referring to the children of Judah which occurs in the section.

It is thus possible that the document in this particular case may have been derived from some official archives of the tribe of Judah; wherein, as specially intended for the tribe of Judah, the children of Judah might be addressed in the second person.

(3) Many of those sections of the Pentateuch which are devoted to legislation, use the Perfect with Waw almost exclusively, and the second person does not occur in them. Yet these are commands addressed to the people or to Moses as their representative, e. g., Lev. XIII. Hence the style of these sections is the same as that of sections which are undoubtedly devoted to legislation.

(4) The theory that the writer used documents written in a different person to that of his main narrative, may perhaps be slightly supported by the K'thivh reading עַר עֲבָרָנוּ (Q'ri עָרַ עֲבָרָם) of Josh. v. 1. It is just possible that the writer intended to alter the persons of a narrative in the first person to suit a narrative in the third person, and by oversight left this particular case unaltered.

This supposition does not commit us to the view that the original document was written by a contemporary of the events described. The "us" (נָו) may be used of the nation, as an Englishman might say to-day "We conquered at Waterloo."

(5) There are other cases which do not seem to yield very readily to the ordinary Syntax of the tenses; and in these cases also we can explain the presence of Perfects with Waw, and Imperfects, by assuming the introduction into the narrative of word-for-word quotations from documents possibly well known.

For instance, in Neh. III. 14, 15 there occur some rather difficult tenses, and Driver recommends his readers to examine these for themselves, but does not offer them any help. These verses occur in the account of the building of

the wall. Both the verses begin with simple Perfects and contain a clause with simple Imperfects, in one case two, and in the other, three; the clause with the three Imperfects only differs from the others by the insertion of another word.

Is it possible that here also we have quotations from some document which gave the directions for building as a command, that in the other verses the quotations have been modified, but here for some reason left unaltered?

The theory is now very widely current that many books were composed by a recension and combination of parts of previously existing works. If this is true, it is scarcely possible but that some such accidents as the one assumed above should happen.

The presence of simple Perfects here and there in close connection with Perfects with Waw, e. g., in XIX. 34, may readily be accounted for—

(1) By the close connection with the main series of tenses of what was originally separated as an explanatory note or addition.

(2) By the tendency of copyists to assimilate the tenses to what might seem to them the more natural narrative tenses.

(3) By other errors of copyists.

Thus in XIX. 34 **ופגע בזבלון מנגב ובאשר פגע מים**, the second **פגע** may be an accidental repetition of the first, the **פגע** and the **באשר** may have been transposed at a time when **ופגע** and **פגע....** were used interchangeably, or the original document may have omitted to state the fact as to the border westwards, and the author of the Book of Joshua may have added it.

OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES MESSIANICALLY APPLIED BY THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny City, Pa.

III.

PROVERBS.

- VI. 22. "When thou goest, it shall lead thee; when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee; and when thou awakest, it shall talk with thee."
"When thou goest, it shall lead thee," in this world; "when thou sleepest, it shall keep thee," in the hour of death; "and when thou awakest in the days of the Messiah, it shall talk with thee," in the world to come.—*Siphre* (ed. Friedmann), p. 74, col. 2.

ECCLESIASTES.

- I. 9. "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done, is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun."
Rabbi Berachya said in the name of Rabbi Isaac: The last Redeemer will be like the first (Moses), as the first put his wife and his sons upon an ass (Exod. iv. 20), the last one will also ride upon an ass; as the first fed his people with manna (Exod. xvi. 4), so will the last one also bring manna down from heaven (Ps. lxxii. 16); as the first made rise the well, so will the last one also bring forth water (Joel iii. 18). Thus here is something of which it is said, Behold this is something new; but it has already been.—*Midrash on Ecclesiastes* or *Cohemoth* in loco.
- I. 11. "Neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come with those that shall come after."
Targum: There shall be no memorial of them with the generation which shall be in the days of King Messiah.
- VII. 24. "That which is far off, and exceeding deep, who can find it out?"
Targum: Behold, now, it is far off from the children of men to know all that has been from the beginning of the days of the world, also the secret of the day of death, and the secret of the day that King Messiah shall come; who is he that shall find it out by wisdom?
- XI. 8. "But if a man live many years, and rejoice in them all," etc.
If a man lives many years, let him rejoice in the joy of the law, but let him also remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many; and much as he may have learned, yet it is empty before the teaching of the Messiah.—*Midrash* in loco.

XII. 1. "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not," etc.

Rabbi Hiya, the son of Nehemiah, says, Those days are meant which will be such that there will be neither guilt nor merit.—*Midrash* in loco.

"The evil days" are old age; and "the years" are the days of Messiah, when there will be no merit and no guilt.—*Talmud Shabbath*, fol. 151, col. 2.

SONG OF SOLOMON.¹

I. 8.—"If thou know not, O thou fairest among women, go thy way forth by the footsteps of the flock, and feed thy kids beside the shepherd's tent."

Targum: The Holy One, blessed be he! said to Moses the prophet, It is required of them that they may do away the captivity, that the assembly which is like to a fair virgin whom my soul loveth, walk in the path of the righteous, that she order the prayers according to the mouth of her princes, that she guide her offspring, and that she teach her sons, who are like to kids of the goats, to go to the house of the congregation, and to the house of inquiry. And in this righteousness they shall be sustained in the captivity until the time that I shall send King Messiah, and he shall conduct them into rest to their dwelling places, namely, to the house of the sanctuary, which David and Solomon and the shepherds of Israel do build for them.

I. 17. "The beams of our house are cedar, and our rafters of fir."

Targum: Solomon, the prophet, said: "How beautiful is the house of the sanctuary of the Lord, which is built by my hands, of wood of Gulmish; but far more beautiful will be the house of the sanctuary which shall be built in the days of the King Messiah, the beams of which will be of the cedars of the garden of Eden, and whose rafters will be of cypress, pine and box."

II. 8. "The voice of my beloved; behold, he cometh leaping," etc.

Rabbi Hunya said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, "The voice of my beloved, behold he cometh," this is the King Messiah.—*Midrash* in loco.²

II. 9. "My beloved is like a roe or a young hart: behold he standeth behind our wall," etc.

Rabbi Isaac said: As the roe appears and disappears, so also did the first Messiah appear before them and then disappear.... Now as the first Redeemer, so is also the last Redeemer. As the first appeared and disappeared, so likewise the last. And how long will he be hid from them? According to Rabbi Tanchuma in the name of Rabbi Hama, the son of Rabbi Hanina, and according to Rabbi Nehemiah in the name of Rabbi Hoshaya, forty-five

¹ Wherever in the Book of Song of Solomon the name Solomon is mentioned, it applies not to Solomon, but to him who is the peace, excepting viii. 12, where Solomon speaks of himself.—*Talmud Shebuoth*, fol. 35, col. 2.

² The same we find in the *Yalkut* and in the *Pesikta* in loco.

days, as it is said: "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days" (Dan. xii. 11, 12). And how much are the other days? Forty-five days, in which Messiah will appear and then disappear.—*Pesikta* (ed. Buber) p. 49*ab*.

II. 10-12. "My beloved spake and said unto me," etc.

"My beloved spake," i. e., through Elijah; "and said unto me" through the King Messiah. What does he say to me? "Rise up, my love, my fair one! for, lo, the winter," i. e., the reign of the Cutheans, who persuaded the world and led it astray by its lies "is past; the rain," i. e., subjection, "is gone and over; the flowers," i. e., the signs of victory, "appear on the earth." Which are they? Rabbi Berachya said in the name of Rabbi Isaac: Those four carpenters (cf. Zech. i. 20), viz., Elijah, King Messiah, Melchizedek and the anointed warrior. "The time of the singing is come," i. e., the time is come to redeem Israel; "and the voice of the turtle," i. e., the voice of the King Messiah, "is heard in our land," which exclaims: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings" (Isa. lii. 7).—*Midrash* in loco; *Pesikta* (ed. Buber), p. 49.

II. 13. "The fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell."

Rabbi Hiya bar Abba said: The days of the Messiah will be preceded by a great plague, which will destroy the wicked. "And the vines with the tender grape," etc. This refers to those who are left, as it is said, "He that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem" (Isa. iv. 3).—*Midrash* in loco; *Pesikta*, l. c.

III. 11. "In the day of his espousals and in the day of the gladness of his heart."

This denotes the days of the Messiah, because the Holy One, blessed be he! is likened to a bridegroom, "as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride" (Isa. lxii. 5); "and in the day of the gladness of his heart" refers to the rebuilding of the temple (for it is said): "And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people" (Isa. lxxv. 19).—*Yalkut* in loco (vol. II. p. 178*d*).

IV. 5. "The two breasts are like two young roes that are twins," etc.

Targum: Two deliverers there shall be to deliver thee, Messiah, Son of David, and Messiah, Son of Ephraim, who are like to Moses and Aaron, the sons of Jochebed, who were as two fair gazelles that are twins.

IV. 16. "Awake, O north wind, and come, thou south."

This refers to King Messiah, who is in a northern region, that he may come and rebuild the sanctuary, which is to be in the south.—*Midrash* in loco.

VI. 10. "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning," etc.

This signifies the redemption of the Messiah. For as, when the morning

risers. the darkness flees before it, so shall darkness fall upon the kingdoms of this world when the Messiah comes. And yet again, as "the sun and moon appear, so will the kingdom of the Messiah also appear."¹—*Yalkut in loco*, (II., fol. 180, col. 3).

VII. 6. "How fair and how pleasant art thou."

How fair art thou by the exercise of commandments, how pleasant by kindness... how fair in good works, how pleasant in this world; how fair in the world to come, how pleasant in the days of the Messiah.—*Midrash in loco*.

VII. 13. "The mandrakes give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant fruits," etc.

Targum: And when it shall please the Lord to redeem his people from captivity, it shall be said to King Messiah, Now the end of the captivity is come, and the righteousness of the righteous smelleth sweet before me, as the smell of balsam.

VIII. 1. "O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother," etc.

Targum: And at that time shall King Messiah be revealed to the congregation of Israel. Then shall the children of Israel say to him, Come, be thou with us for a brother, and we will go up to Jerusalem, and we will suck with thee the meanings of the law, even as a suckling sucketh the breasts of its mother.

VIII. 2. "I would lead thee, and bring thee into my mother's house, who would instruct me."

Targum: I will lead thee, O King Messiah, and I will bring thee to the house of my sanctuary, and thou shalt teach me to fear before the Lord, and to walk in his ways, and there will we keep the feast of Leviathan,² and we will drink old wine, which has been reserved in its grapes since the day the world was created, and of the pomegranates, the fruits which are prepared for the righteous in the garden of Eden.

¹ That the morning was looked upon as the emblem of redemption, we see from the following: Rabbi Hiya, the Great, and Rabbi Simeon, the son of Halaphta, once walked together before sunrise in the valley of Arbela, when the hind of the morning announced the dawn of the day. Verily, said Rabbi Hiya to Rabbi Simeon, so is Israel's redemption. It commences little and insignificant, as the prophet says: "When I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me" (Mic. vii. 8), but with increasing power it completes itself (as is seen from the history of Esther, cf. Esth. ii. 19; vi. 11; viii. 15, 16).—*Jerus. Talmud Berachoth*, fol. 2, col. 3.

² The Jews expect a very sumptuous feast to be made for the righteous in the days of the Messiah, which will consist of all sorts of flesh, fish and fowl. The Jewish liturgy for the feast of Pentecost has the following: "He will certainly bestow on us the portion which he has promised us of old. The sporting of Leviathan with the ox of the high mountains (alluding to the Behemoth), when they shall approach each other and engage in battle. With his horn he thrusts at the mightiest beasts, but the Leviathan will leap towards him with his fins and great strength. His creator will then approach him with his great sword, and will prepare him for a banquet for the righteous, who will be seated at a table formed of jasper and carbuncle, with a river of balm flowing before them. When they will delight themselves and be satiated with the bowls of wine prepared at the creation, and reserved in the wine-press."

VIII. 4. "I charge you, O daughter of Jerusalem."

Targum: King Messiah shall say, I adjure you, O my people of the house of Israel, wherefore do ye contend against the people of the land, (desiring) to go out of captivity? And wherefore do ye rise up against the army of Gog and Magog? Tarry ye a little, till the people be consumed who have gone up to wage war against Jerusalem, and afterwards the Lord of the world will remember unto you the mercies of the righteous, and it shall be pleasure before him to redeem you.

VIII. 11. "A thousand pieces of silver."

These words refer to the kingdom of heaven.—*Talmud Shebuoth*, fol. 35, col. 2.

ISAIAH.

I. 25, 26. "And I will turn my hand upon thee," etc.

Rabbi Simlai said in the name of Rabbi Elieser, the son of Rabbi Simeon: The son of David shall not come till all the judges and rulers in Israel shall have ceased, for it is said: "And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin, and I will restore thy judges."—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1.

IV. 2. "In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel."

Targum: At that time the Messiah of the Lord shall be for joy and for glory, and the doers of the law for magnificence and for praise, for them that are escaped of Israel."

VI. 13. "But yet it shall be a tenth, and it shall return," etc.

Rabbi Seïra said that Rabbi Jeremiah, the son of Abba, said, In the time in which Messiah shall come, hostilities will increase against the wise men, as it has been said before that Samuel said one suffering after the other, for it is said, "But yet it shall be," etc.—*Talmud Kethuboth*, fol. 112, col. 2.

VIII. 14. "And he shall be for a sanctuary, and for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence," etc.

Jehudah and Hezekiah, the sons of Rabbi Hiyah, were sitting at a meal, in the presence of Rabbi, without uttering a word. Give some wine to the boys, exclaimed Rabbi, that they may feel encouraged to say something. When they had drunk the wine, they opened their mouths, and said: The Son of David will not come, until the two patriarchal houses of Israel shall cease, that is, the Head of the captivity in Babylon, and the Prince in the land of Israel; for it is said: "And he shall be for a sanctuary," etc. My children, exclaimed Rabbi, you are thrusting thorns into my eyes. Said Rabbi Hiya, Rabbi,

take it not ill of them; wine is given with seventy,¹ and so is a secret, when the wine comes in, the secret goes out.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 38, col. 1.

- IX. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon," etc.

Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said: When Esau met Jacob, he said to him: My brother Jacob, let us walk together in this world. Jacob replied: "Let my lord, I pray thee, pass over before his servant" (Gen. xxxiii. 14). What is the meaning of "I pray thee, pass over"? Jacob said to him: I have yet to supply the King Messiah, of whom it is said, "Unto us a child is born."—*Midrash on Deuteronomy*, sec. 1 (on chap. ii. 4).

Targum: The prophet said to the house of David, For unto us a child is born, to us a son is given, and he shall receive the law upon him to keep it, and his name is called from eternity, Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Continuing for ever, the Messiah; for peace shall be multiplied upon us in his days.

- IX. 7. "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end," etc. Rabbi Nathan said, "and give thee peace" (Num. vi. 26) means the peace of the government of the house of David, as it is said, "of the increase," etc.—*Midrash on Numbers*, vi. 22, sec. 11; *Siphre* (ed. Friedmann), p. 12, col. 2.

Bar Kapara expounded at Sepphoris: Why is the word **לסרבה**, "the increase," written with a closed mem (the *final* mem **ם**, and not with the usual mem **מ**)? The Holy One, blessed be he! wished to make Hezekiah the Messiah, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog. But the attribute of judgment pleaded against it, and said, David the king of Israel repeated so many songs and praises, and thou hast not made him the Messiah; and yet thou art thinking of making Hezekiah the Messiah, for whose sake so many miracles have been performed, and who, nevertheless, has not repeated one song of praise! So that counsel was closed (and hence the closed mem).—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 94, col. 1.

- X. 27. "And it shall come to pass in that day that his burden shall be taken away," etc.

Targum: And it shall come to pass. . . and the people shall be broken before Messiah.

- XI. 1. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots."

Targum: And there shall go forth a king from the sons of Jesse, and Messiah shall be anointed from his children's children. See also Ps. cx. 2.

- XI. 2. "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and," etc.

¹ The word "wine" is in Hebrew **יין**, which has the numerical value (i. e., $\text{י} = 50 + \text{י} = 10 + \text{נ} = 50$) of seventy, so also the word "secret," i. e., **סוד**: $\text{ד} = 4 + \text{י} = 10 + \text{ס} = 60$, = 70.

Concerning the Messiah it is written: "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 93, col. 2. See also Gen. i. 2.

- XI. 3. "And shall make him of quick understanding (or scent) in the fear of the Lord, and he shall," etc.

On this the Talmud remarks: Rabbi Alexander says: The word *והריחו* (i. e., his scent) teaches us that the Holy One has laden the Messiah with commandments and sufferings which were as heavy as millstones.... Bar Coziba reigned two years and a half, and he told the Rabbis that he was the Messiah. They replied, It is written of Messiah that he would scent out the good; canst thou do the same? When they saw that he could not do it, they slew him.—*Sanhedrin*, fol. 93, col. 2.

- XI. 6. "The wolf shall also dwell with the lamb."

Targum: In the day of Israel's Messiah, peace shall be multiplied on earth.

- XI. 10. "And in that day there shall be a record."

Cf. Gen. XLIX. 10.

- XIV. 29. "Rejoice not thou, whole Palestina, because the rod of him that smote thee is broken, for out of the serpent's root shall come forth a cockatrice," etc.

Targum: Rejoice not....for from the children's children of Jesse shall proceed Messiah, and his works shall be among you as flying serpents.

- XVI. 1. "Send ye the lamb to the ruler of the land," etc.

Targum: They will bring tributes to the Messiah of Israel.

- XVI. 5. "And in mercy shall the throne be established."

Then Israel's Messiah shall establish his throne in mercy.

- XVIII. 5. "He shall both cut off the sprigs with pruning-knives," etc.

Rabbi Hama, the son of Hanina, said: The Son of David will not come until the despicable government be destroyed from Israel; for it is said: "And he shall cut off the sprigs with pruning-knives," and it is also written further on: "In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of hosts of a people scattered and peeled" (*ibid.* v. 7).—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 98, col. 1.

- XXI. 11, 12. "The burden of Dumah. He called to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, the morning cometh," etc.

Rabbi Hanina, the son of Rabbi Abuhu, said in the codex of Rabbi Meir, I found "the burden of Dumah" written "burden of Rome." Rabbi Joshua ben Levi said: When one asks you: Where is your God?—answer: In the great city of Rome; for it is said: "He calleth to me out of Seir." Rabbi Simeon, the son of Yochaï, said: Wherever the Israelites were banished, the Shechinah was banished with them. They were banished into Egypt, and the Shechinah was banished with them, and this is the meaning of "Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house?" (1 Sam. ii. 27). They were banished to Babylon, and so

also the Shechinah, for it is written: "For your sake I have sent to Babylon" (Isa. XLIII. 14). They were banished to Media, and so the Shechinah, "And I will set my throne in Elam" (Jer. XLIX. 38), where Elam means Media, as it is said: "And I was at Shushan in the palace which is in the province of Elam" (Dan. VIII. 2). They were banished to Greece, and so the Shechinah, as it is said: "And I raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece" (Zech. IX. 13). They were banished to Rome, and so the Shechinah, as it is said: "He calleth me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night?" The Israelites said to Isaiah: Isaiah, our master, what shall yet happen to us from this night? Wait, he replied, I will inquire. Having inquired, he returned to them and they asked again: "Watchman, what of the night? watchman, what of the night?" He replied, "The watchman said, the morning cometh." And night too? Yes, but not so as you think, replied he; the morning comes for the righteous and the night for the wicked, the morning for the Israelites and the night for the idolaters. They said to him, When? He replied: When ye seek (God), he seeks you too, as it is said: "If ye will enquire, enquire ye." They said to him, What keeps the morning back? He replied, Repentance; for it is said: "Return, come."—*Jer. Taanith*, fol. 64, col. 1. What is the meaning of "It is a night to be much observed"? (Exod. XII. 42). (A night) in which God did great things to the righteous, as he did great things to the Israelites in Egypt. In that night he saved Hezekiah; in that night he saved Hananiah and his associates; in it he saved Daniel from the lion's den, and in that same night the Messiah and Elijah will prove themselves as great, as it is said: "The watchman said, the morning cometh, and also the night" (Isa. XXI. 12).—*Midrash on Exod.* XII. 41; sec. 18.

XXIII. 15. "According to the days of one king."

What king is this that is singled out as one? Thou must say, This is the King Messiah, and no other.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 99, col. 1.

XXIV. 23. "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed."

Why the pleonastic *waw* (in "and his offering" וְקָרְבָּנוֹ, Num. VII. 13)? Rabbi Bibi said in the name of Rabbi Reuben, This refers to the six things which were taken from the first man, but which return again with an offspring of Nahshon, which is the Messiah. These things are: his splendor, life, stature, the fruits of the earth, the fruits of the tree, and the light. His splendor, for it is said: "Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away" (Job XIV. 20); his life, for it is said: "For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. III. 19); his stature, for it is said: "And Adam hid himself" (Gen. III. 8); the fruits of the earth and the fruits of the tree, for it is said: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake" (Gen. III. 17); the lights, for it is said: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed."—*Midrash on Numbers* VII. 13; sec. 13.

XXV. 8. "He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

On the festivals of the new moon, of dedication, and of purim, the mourning women may wail aloud and may clap the palms of their hands together, but must not sing funeral dirges; but when the corpse is interred, they must neither wail aloud, nor sing dirges. .'. But of the future ages that are to come, it is said: "He shall swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."—*Talmud Moed Katon*, fol. 28, col. 2.

In this world we are given up to death on account of our sins, but in the world to come "he will swallow up death in victory," etc.—*Siphra in Yalkut on Leviticus*, XXIV. 31.

The ninth sign of the coming of the Messiah will be that death will cease, as it is said: "He will swallow up death in victory," etc.—*Midrash on Exod.* XII. 12; sec. 15.

XXVII. 13. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpet shall be blown," etc.

This passage is quoted in connection with the future deliverance.—*Talmud Rosh ha-Shanah*, fol. 11, col. 2.

The rabbis have taught: The ten tribes have no portion in the world to come; for it is said: "And the Lord rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation" (Deut. XXIX. 28). "And he rooted them out of their land," that is, from this world; "and cast them into another land," that is, the world to come. The words of Rabbi Akiva, Rabbi Simeon, the son of Jehudah of the village Acco, said in the name of Rabbi Simeon, If their designs continue as they are this day, they will not return; but if not, they will return. Rabbi says, they will enter the world to come; for it is said: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpet shall be blown," etc.—*Talmud Sanhedrin*, fol. 110, col. 2.

The Holy One, blessed be he! said: In this world I gave my law with the sound of a trumpet, but in the future I will gather your exiles with the sound of a trumpet, as it is said: "And it shall come to pass in that day," etc.—*Yalkut on Num.* X. 2.

XXVIII. 5. "In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory."

Targum: In that time shall the Messiah of the Lord of hosts be a crown of joy.

THE PASSIVE OF QĀL.

BY L. N. DEMBITZ,

Louisville, Ky.

Should I ever edit a Hebrew grammar, I would set down as one of the paradigms of the verb, on an equal footing with the others, a Passive of the Qāl—standing in the same relation to it, as Pū'āl stands to Pī'el and as Hōph'āl stands to Hīph'il.

The current teaching on the subject is, that, in biblical Hebrew, this Passive no longer exists, except in the Participle פֶּעוּל, but that its Preterit and Future are lost. Until Jules Oppert proved the contrary, it was also thought that the Nunnation, and the end-vowels for case and mood were not to be found in biblical Hebrew; but we find them now in numerous places even in the vowelizing of the Massorites, and can never know in how many other places those gentlemen, in their zeal for a uniform grammar, suppressed them. They left the endings only where the letter of the text, aside from any vowelizing, compelled them to do so.

It is the same with the Passive Qāl. There is a small number of verbs in which (although there is no Pī'el or Hīph'il) Pū'āl and Hōph'āl forms are used in the Passive sense, or in which these conjugations have not the sense of which the Passive is sought to be conveyed. The foremost of these words is לָקַח. There is no room either for an *intensive* or for a *causative*, of the verb "to take." Yet we find the Future יִקַּח and the Preterit לָקַח; the former classed as Hōph'āl, the latter, though without the Dāghēś, as Pū'āl, without any substantial reason why two conjugations should be chosen to furnish the two tenses. A glance at an Arabic grammar suggests the answer to the riddle; both forms are Qāl in the Passive. The form usually employed in Hebrew to denote the Passive is Nīph'āl; but the letters of the text would in neither case lend themselves to Nīph'āl; in the Future the loss of the ל precludes the reading יִלְקַח. From the root נָתַן, we find in like manner יִתֵּן which has no sense as a Hōph'āl, but is a Passive Qāl, by the side of נָתַן; yet we do not find נָתַח in the Preterit, probably because the letters might just as well be read נִתְּחָה.

In like manner we have יָקַם "will be avenged"—a so-called Hōph'āl, without a corresponding Hīph'il—and יָלְדָה a pretended Pū'āl, "she was born," where the Pī'el יָלַד would furnish an improper meaning, it being applied only to the act of midwifery. That לָקַח is the only word which has its Passive assigned to two conjugations, other than Nīph'āl, arises from the circumstance that in this word alone a letter other than נ is elided in the Future; hence it is the only word in which the letters cannot in either tense be voweled so as to produce a Nīph'āl.

One who takes the trouble will find a number of other passages, and of other verbs, beside the four roots (לר, נקם, נתן, לקח) that I have named. After the Massorites had taken up the arbitrary notion that there must not be a short ŭ or ǝ in an open syllable, the Dāghēsh in ילר and the pretense of a Pŭ'āl followed as a necessity. A more rational system of vowelizing than that which grew up on the corrupt pronunciation of Galilee, would show a much closer kinship between Hebrew grammar and that of classic Arabic, than the Massora discloses, though even there it may be read between the lines.

➤CONTRIBUTED♦NOTES.◀

Diqduq.—The word דִּקְדּוּק is derived from the root דִּקַּק which signifies to beat small, to crush, to pulverize, whence the noun דֶּק a thin covering, a veil, and the adjective דָּק fine, thin, small, subtle, etc. Although the verb itself, and its cognates and derivatives, are classical Hebrew, yet the term דִּקְדּוּק is altogether of rabbinical origin. In a figurative sense, the verb signifies to discuss, to be exact, or accurate, to analyze, separate, refine, criticise, the noun importing disquisition, accuracy, or exactness. Buxtorf, in his lexicon, defines דִּקְדּוּק thus, “*Subtilis et accurata disquisitio, grammaticā.*” The term was appropriated by the Jewish doctors of the Middle Ages to designate *grammar*, and has been applied to that department of scientific study by the Jewish grammarians ever since. “Grammar,” says G. J. Vossius, “is called by the rabbis דִּקְדּוּק, that is *subtilitas*, because it treats accurately, and in a refined manner, with utmost precision, the letters, points, inflections, and entire nature and constitution of words in the Hebrew language.” So Buxtorf, “Grammar is the *ars bene loquendi Hebrais, hebraice.* In Hebrew, it is called דִּקְדּוּק.” Whoever has studied Hebrew critically, in such grammars as those of Gesenius, Freytag, Hupfeld, Ewald, Stier, Nordheimer, Nägelsbach, or Green, or has been able to read the grammars of Chayug, Kimchi, or Ben Zeeb, will be at no loss to discover the remarkable propriety of the application of the rabbinical term to the critical and philosophical structure of the language, its phenomena, and laws. The term itself also reveals the wonderful critical spirit with which the mediæval Hebrew doctors set about the institution of grammatical science, so far as relates to the holy tongue. It acquaints us with the nature of their study, refined, incisive, exact, examining, with shrewdness and care, the letters and words of the language, their origin, nature, inflection, structure, and relations. This was the charm that constantly engaged their attention, since the era of the Massorite leaders, who, for the most part, contented themselves with the more elementary beginnings of grammatical science, such as connecting the letters, affixing the points and accents, noting the agreement or difference of words, as also their various writing, but not advancing, as did the mediæval scholars, to an observation of the genius of the language, describing its phenomena, ascertaining its laws, anomalies, and analogies, investigating its sources, or causes, and kindred relations, or gathering from the language itself whatever might make for the more sure interpretation of the Sacred Books. The men of the Massora, בְּעֵלֵי הַמְּסוֹרָה, did great service, in their labor to establish a correct text, giving, in doubt-

ful cases, both קרי and כתיב, and by their system of pointing, preserving a true pronunciation, as, by their system of accents, not only indicating the tone-syllable, dividing the sentence, regulating the cantillation, and transmitting, in many important cases, the traditional interpretation, thus imparting great precision to the language, and making succeeding ages debtors to their toil. But their work, in comparison with that of the doctors of דקדוק, was rather that which a Priscian and Aristarchus would have called by the name "*Grammaticistica*," not "*Grammatica*." The work, on the other hand, of the noble Jewish scholars, beginning with the Karaite doctors in their contest with the Talmudists, exalted the treatment of the Hebrew language to the dignity of a true science, just such a critical and philosophical דקדוק as the language required. Alting, in his admirable Grammar of the Punctuation of the Holy Tongue, has aptly said. "This is a firm persuasion in my mind, that only then will Hebrew grammar come to be a true דקדוק, *Subtilitas*, when the various reasons of it, and of its pointing, are deduced from the fundamental principles of the language itself,"—an anticipation of the triumphs of more modern times.

Leopold Dukes informs us, in a foot-note to a passage in his *Literaturhistorische Mittheilungen*, that, in the Talmud, there is no distinct technical expression for the word *grammar*. The application of the words דקדוק and מרדקדק, the former to *grammar*, the latter to *grammarian*, is of later date. The words are indeed found in the Talmud, but are used simply to signify "to observe with scrutiny," or "to consider accurately," or "observe exactness"—(*Genauigkeit beobachten*) and, in this sense, are employed to designate the faithful following, or followers, of the Mosaic commandments. Subsequently, the term מרדקדק came to signify the Hebrew punctator, because of the accuracy required in pointing the text. Dukes also informs us that Rabbi Menahem Ben Seruq was the first Jewish author in whom the expressions דקדוק הלשון for grammar, and מרדקדקי הלשון for grammarians, of the Holy Tongue, are found. All that is meant, evidently, by this is that, antecedently to Menahem, the term דקדוק was not used in combination with the other, a statement supported by abundant evidence drawn from the preceding treatises on grammatical science. The title of Saadia's "Grammatical Works" is מלאכת הדקדוק. The title of one of Rabbi Jonah Ben Giannach's book is *Kitab Al-Luma*, which Ewald renders *Buch der Untersuchung* (*Book of Investigation*) and substantially equivalent to דקדוק. So Munk in his interesting papers in the *Asiatic Journal*, 1851, p. 425, gives the title and explanation of Saadia's work "*Kitab Al-Luma*, c'est-a-dire *Livre du Diquduq*, mot hébreu dont le sens est examen, recherche, et signifie faire des recherches dans la langue." The title given by Aben Ezra to his Hebrew translation of Chayug's grammatical works is ספרי דקדוק *Books of Grammar*, and Chayug himself is denominated המרדקדק הראשון *the Chief Grammarian*, and ראש המרדקדקים *Chief of Grammarians*. The title of Aben Ezra's own work on grammar is simply

דְּקָדוּקִים which would be appropriately translated by *Grammaticæ Variorum*. More evidence of the same sort could be adduced from the works of Rashi¹ and Kimchi. Bartolucci mentions an anonymous Hebrew grammar, found in the Vatican Library, with the title **דְּקָדוּק לִשׁוֹן קוֹדֶשׁ** *Grammar of the Holy Language*. Not a few Christian writers on Hebrew grammar have, in imitation of the Hebrew doctors, published their own works under the Hebrew title. This brief notice of *Diqduq* may serve to satisfy the justifiable curiosity of students, or beginners in the study, of the Hebrew language, who may have met with the word unexplained, and desire to know something of its origin and history. It is a synonym for "Scientific Grammar." Kimchi, at the close of his *Michlol*, has a verse which is quoted by both Buxtorf and Bythner, in their grammars, in which the word occurs; a verse containing excellent advice to all students. We subjoin it, for the benefit of such. It is a little sermon.

אֲשֶׁר לָמַד וְתוֹרָה לוֹ לָקַנָּן
וְלֹא לָמַד יְסוֹר דְּקָדוּק וְלֹא בֵן
כְּמוֹ חוֹרֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר יִנְהֵן שׂוֹרִים
וְיָרוּ מִבְּלִי מִלָּמַד וְדַרְבָּן

which, in Latin dress, appears thus,—

Qui discit, et lex ei (est) in possessionem,
Et non discit fundamenta *Diqduq*, neque intelligit,
(Est) sicut arator qui agit boves,
Et manus ejus (est) sine baculo aut stimulo.

NATHANIEL WEST, D. D.,
St. Paul, Minn.

Notes on Malachi.—MAL. I. 3.—The Revisers well translate **תְּנוּת** *jackals* instead of *dragons*, as Luther (*Drachen*) and the Authorized Version have it. The Septuagint has *δῶματα ἐρήμων dwellings of the desert*. DeWette, and Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, still translate "domicilia, mansiones;" but Ewald (*Gram.*, § 175*b*), Köhler, Stier, and others, regard **תְּנוּת** as a feminine form used here instead of the more common **תְּנִים**, from the sing. **תֵּן** *wolf, jackal*, or a similar animal. The preposition **לְ** can be more readily explained if we translate "jackals," not "habitations."

I. 9.—We prefer the margin, "From your hand" to the text of the Revision, "By your means." The context is: "Entreat God's favor [looking, at the same time, at the polluted offerings which God received from your hands]—will he accept any of your persons?" Compare verse 13, **מִיָּדְכֶם**, which the Revisers there translate "of your hands."

¹ Not Rashi the Commentator, but Rashi the Grammarian, Jarchi.

II. 3.—“I will rebuke the seed.” Some ancient versions translate “I will curse for you the arm,” reading **הִזְרַע** instead of **הִזְרֵעַ**. Among German critics Ewald, Reinke, Köhler, and even Keil, accept the change. The thought would then be: The priest raises his arm to bless the people; but the Lord curses it,—yea, does more, strews dung into the faces of the officiating priests, dishonoring them. Yahweh exercises *jus talionis*: they have despised him; now he treats them with contempt.

II. 12.—**עַר וְעִנָּה** the Revisers translate “him that waketh and him that answereth.” It seems to me that the use of “waketh” does not make it clear whether the Revisers thought **עַר** was transitive or intransitive. **עַר** signifies a person who is awake. Hitzig has well said that because a man is an **עַר** he is not of necessity a **שֹׁמֵר**. Delitzsch (in his “Lectures”) translates “him that is awake and him that answereth.” He does not regard the words as correlated poles (as, for example, “head and tail”), but as the signification of one human being; otherwise, we might expect **קָרָא** or **שָׁמַר**.

II. 15.—We prefer the margin, “And not one hath done so, who had a residue of the spirit,” to the text. The Israelites refer, it seems to me, in their thoughts, to Abraham, who disowned Hagar, and sent her away; they regard him as also having acted treacherously, that is, as having broken the covenant made with Hagar. But the prophet answers, The one you think of hath not done so. Now follows **וְכֵן הָאֱחָד** “and what has he done?” (**עָשָׂה** is implied). “He sought the seed of God.” Thus we would translate, in preference to the reading of the Revisers, “And did he not make one?”

CONCLUSION.—The Hebrew student will find, in the Hebrew Bible, an addition to the text after III. 24. There the words **יִתְקַן סִימָן** are found. The letters **יִתְקַן** stand for **יִשְׁעִיהוּ** *Isaiah*, **תְּרִי עֵשֶׂר**, scroll of the minor prophets, **קִינֹת** *Threni*, and **קֹהֶלֶת** *Kohleth*. These have a special sign, namely, **סִימָן**. In the synagogue, the verse preceding the last verse of these books or scrolls was to be repeated, because the last verse sounded too harsh. Isaiah closes with “For their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh;” but in the synagogue verse 23 was repeated after verse 24, “to close with words of comfort.” Thus also here in Malachi and in the other books mentioned.

H. J. WEBER,
Philadelphia.

Abraham Firkowitsch.—The article entitled “Writing among the Hebrews,” which Professor H. L. Strack contributed to the July number of *HEBRAICA*, possesses a peculiar interest to students. I have especially noted his comments on the manuscripts unearthed in the Crimea by Abraham Firkowitsch, and which Professor Strack—in opposition to Professor D. Chwolson—asserts were forgeries. With the main argument, in this particular case, I am not entirely familiar; but

it seems passing strange that many of the best scholars of our century had faith in Firkowitsch, and considered his discoveries genuine, and of a highly valuable character. His "finds" were, besides, the means of introducing to the world of letters an author whose fame rests principally on his works concerning the history and literature of the Karaites, based upon these same writings which Firkowitsch claimed to have found, as narrated above. I refer to Simcha Pinsker, the learned Galician, whose *לקוטי קדמוניות* ("Collection from the Days of Old"), a ponderous volume, devoted to the Karaites, their origin and religious development as Jewish schismatics, is recognized as *the* book on the subject. Pinsker's enthusiasm over Karaism knew no bounds; and while some of his conclusions appear rather problematical, it is hard to believe, in view of all the attending circumstances, that Firkowitsch wilfully perpetrated, or even countenanced, the monstrous forgeries with which he is charged.

HENRY S. MORAIS,
Philadelphia.

Mr. Bennett's Articles on the Hebrew Tenses.—The outline of these articles, one of which appeared in the July *HEBRAICA*, the second appearing in this number, will be of practical aid especially to beginners in the study of Hebrew. The principal works referred to in these articles are

- (1) Davidson's "Hebrew Grammar;"
- (2) Robertson's "Translation of Müller's Outlines of Hebrew Syntax;"
- (3) Driver's "Use of the Tenses in Hebrew;"
- (4) Morris' "Historical Outlines of English Accidence," and
- (5) Morris' "English Grammar" (series of Literature Primers).

PART I.

1. *The Actual Usage of the Tenses in the Hexateuch compared with statements in Grammars.*

2. *Statements of Grammars:*

- (1) Their relation to the old theory of the tenses;
- (2) Their want of clearness as to the differences of style in poetry and prose;
- (3) Their subjection to German influence.

3. *The Occurrences and Usage of the Tenses in the Hexateuch; Deductions as to Usage; Examination of Exceptional Cases.*

4. *The Sequence of the Tenses* (with special reference to the Imperfect with Waw Cons.):

- (1) Statements of grammars;
- (2) Way in which they would [naturally be understood;
- (3) Tested by the usage of the Hexateuch;
- (4) Deductions;

- (5) Attempt to construct theory on the basis of these results;
- (6) Objections to statements of grammars; Résumé.

PART II.

1. *Hebrew and English:*

- (1) German indirect and unsuitable medium of Hebrew knowledge;
- (2) Modern system of English syntax ignored;
- (3) Two simple tense-forms in Hebrew and English;
- (4) Ambiguity as to use of one of these in both languages;
- (5) In each language same form in two different uses differently derived.

2. *Uses of the Perfect:*

- (1) Hebrew Perfect includes the uses of the tenses of the English Perfect;
- (2) Uses of the form of the English Present Perfect include most of the uses of Hebrew Perfect.

3. *Uses of the Imperfect:*

- (1) The uses of the Hebrew Imperfect include the uses of the tenses of the English Indefinite;
- (2) The uses of the form of the English Indefinite Present include most of those of the Hebrew Imperfect;
- (3) The same true of the English Future Indefinite;
- (4) Summary;
- (5) Alternation of tenses.

4. *Tenses of Joshua xv.—xix.:*

- (1) Statement of facts;
- (2) According to Driver, tenses frequentative;
- (3) Theory that sections are direct quotations from documents containing decrees.

An Examination on Psalms XL.—LXXII.—That our readers may gain a general idea of what an examination in “Old Testament Exegesis” means in England, we subjoin the “paper” of such an examination on Psalms XL.—LXXII., as conducted by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne. The last requirement, namely, the translation, with notes, of a passage of which the pointed text is given, is here omitted.

1. Mention any Psalms in this section which, on internal grounds, may be regarded as of post-Davidic origin. Are there any which, perhaps, point to a Maccabean date? On what grounds has this been held? How does the question stand related to the history of the formation of the Canon?
2. “Secular poems pressed into the service of religion.” To which Psalm may this description apply? If you accept it, can you justify the admission of the Psalm into the Psalter?
3. “Hath brought life and immortality to light.” Illustrate the φωτίσαντος of 2

Tim. i. 10 from the Psalms in this section, tracing out the presentiments of the Psalmist.

4. Give any one view of the circumstances under which Psalm LXVIII. may have been written; trace the connection, so far as it is clear, of the Psalm; and illustrate from it the practice of interweaving phrases from the older Scriptures.
5. Translate, with a few brief grammatical or exegetical notes:—

(a) אֲזַא אֲמַרְתִּי הִנֵּה-בָאֲתִי בְּמַגֵּלֶת-סֶפֶר כְּתוּב עָלַי :

לַעֲשׂוֹת רְצוֹנִי אֱלֹהֵי חֲפָצַי וְתוֹרָתְךָ בְּתוֹךְ מַעֵי :

(b) יִפֶּה נוֹף מִשׁוֹשׁ בְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ הֶרֶץ-צִיּוֹן יִרְכָּתִי צִפּוֹן קִרְיַת מֶלֶךְ רֵב :

(c) נָתַתָּה לִירְאִיָּךְ גַּם לְהִתְנוֹסֵס מִפְּנֵי קֶשֶׁט סֵלָה :

(d) אַחַת וּדְבַר אֱלֹהִים שְׁתִּים-זֹו שְׁמַעְתִּי כִּי עֹז לְאֱלֹהִים :

וּלְךָ-אֲדֹנָי חֶסֶד כִּי-אַתָּה וְתִשָּׁלֵם לְאִישׁ כְּמַעֲשָׁהוּ :

(e) פָּקַדְתָּ הָאָרֶץ וְתִשְׁקָקָה רַבַּת תַּעֲשֶׂרָנָה פֶּלֶג אֱלֹהִים מְלֵא מִיַּם תִּכְּזֶן

דָּגָנָם כִּי-כֵן תִּכְבֶּינָה : תִּלְמִיָּה רֹוה נַחַת גְּדוּדָה בְּרַבִּיכִים תִּקְוֶינָה

צִמְחָה וְתִבְרָךְ :

(f) וַיְחִי וַיִּתֵּן-לֹו מִזֶּהָב וַיִּתְּפֹלֵל בְּעֶדְוֹ תַמִּיד כָּל-הַיּוֹם יִבְרַכְנָהוּ :

יְהִי פֶסֶת-בֵּר וּבְאָרֶץ בְּרָאשׁ הָהָרִים יִרְעֵשׂ בְּלִבָּנוֹן פְּרִי וַיִּצְצוּ מְעִיר

כַּעֲשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ :

6. Point and translate, with notes grammatical or exegetical, where required:—

שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר לִבְנֵי-קִרְחָה : גְּדוֹל יְהוָה וּמִהַלֵּל מֵאֵד בַּעִיר אֱלֹהֵינוּ הֶרֶ-

קִדְשׁוֹ : יִפֶּה נוֹף מִשׁוֹשׁ בְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ הֶרֶץ-צִיּוֹן יִרְכָּתִי צִפּוֹן קִרְיַת מֶלֶךְ רֵב :

אֱלֹהִים בְּאַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ נֹדַע לְמִשְׁגֵּב : כִּי-הִנֵּה הַמַּלְכִּים נֹעֲדוּ עִבְרוּ יַחַד :

הִמָּה רָאוּ כֵן תִּמְהוּ נִבְהָלוּ נִחְפְּזוּ : רַעְדָה אַחֲזוֹתָם שֵׁם חֵיל כִּי־לֹדָה :

בְּרוּחַ קִדִּים תִּשְׁבֵּר אֲנִיּוֹת תְּרִשִׁישׁ : כֹּאשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ בֵּן רֹאֵינוּ בַעִיר-יְהוָה

צְבָאוֹת בַּעִיר אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהִים יִכּוֹנֶנָה עַד-עוֹלָם סֵלָה : דְּמִינוּ אֱלֹהִים

חֲסֹדְךָ בִּקְרֵב הִיכָלְךָ : כִּשְׁמֹךְ אֱלֹהִים כֵּן תִּהְלֹתְךָ עַל-קְצוֹי-אֶרֶץ צֹדֵק

מִלֵּאָה יִמִּינְךָ : יִשְׂמַח הֶרֶץ-צִיּוֹן תִּגְלָנָה בְּנוֹת יְהוּדָה לְמַעַן מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ :

סִבּוֹ צִיּוֹן וְהִקְפִּיפוּ סִפְרוֹ מִגְדְּלֶיהָ : שִׁיתוּ לִבְכֶּם לְחִילָה פִּסְגּוֹ אֲרַמְנוֹתֶיהָ

לְמַעַן תִּסְפְּרוּ לְדוֹר אַחֲרוֹן : כִּי זֶה אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹלָם וְעַד הוּא יִנְהַגְנוּ

עַל-מוֹת :

7. Point and translate, with notes grammatical or exegetical, where required:—

כי לא-אויב יחרפני ואשא לא-משנאי עלי הגריל ואסתר ממנו :
 ואתה אנוש כערכי אלופי ומידעי : אשר יחדו נמתיק סוד בבית אלהים
 נהלך ברגש : ישימות עלמיו ידרו שאול חיים כי-רעות במגורם בקרבם :
 אני אל-אלהים אקרא ויהוה יושיעני : ערב ובקר וצהרים אשיחה
 ואהמה וישמע קולי : פדה בשלום נפשי מקרב-לי כי-ברבים היו עמדי :
 ישמע אל ויענם וישב קדם סלה : אשר אין חליפות למו ולא יראו
 אלהים : שלח ידיו בשלמיו חלל בריתו :

➤EDITORIAL NOTES.◀

A New Volume.—With this number *HEBRAICA* enters upon its third volume. As in the case of its companion-journal, *The Old Testament Student*, the difficulties in the way of its success have been many. Nor have they all been overcome. It is true, however, that the outlook is brighter than it has ever before been; and it is believed that, if those interested in Semitic study will but lend the aid which ought reasonably to be expected of them, the assured continuance of the journal would quickly follow. But what, it will be asked, is the nature of the service asked of them? The answer is two-fold: (1) *Contributions for publication*, written in the line to which the journal is devoted, and with the aim which it seeks to serve. It is not an easy task to secure just the class of contributions which will accomplish the end sought. (2) *Assistance in increasing the circulation* of the journal. This is a matter of prime importance. If it is to do a work in the interest of Hebrew and Semitic study, *HEBRAICA* must reach those who are already interested in such study and also those who, perhaps, may be led to become interested in it. If it is to continue, it must receive a sufficient financial support to make continuance possible. The progress in both of these particulars during the year just past has been noteworthy. A similar progress for another year or two will practically settle the question. May not the Managing Editor of *HEBRAICA* hope to receive from the friends of Semitic study in America and England such substantial aid as will make it possible to issue the journal this year without financial loss.

The Present Number.—We have before referred to the difficulty experienced in finding material worthy of publication in *HEBRAICA*, which would, at the same time, be of practical and immediate value to that large class of our constituency, comparative beginners in Semitic work. This number, we are persuaded, accomplishes this end, as perhaps no previous number has done. Mr. Pinches' valuable paper will be appreciated only by Assyriologists; but the student who has read only the first chapter of Genesis, as well as the professional scholar, will be interested in the clear and sharp presentation by Mr. Bennett of what may well be called the most practical question in Hebrew Syntax. Prof. Green's paper in the line of critical inquiry, and Dr. Pick's in that of Jewish interpretation, will, likewise, be found full of interest to both student and scholar. The "Contributed Notes," also, include topics of general as well as of special interest.

We desire our readers to understand the double stand-point from which *HEBRAICA* must be edited, viz., that of the student, as well as that of the professional Semitist. We trust that we may be able to satisfy both classes of our constituency.

Dr. Jastrow's Dictionary.—We notice with pleasure the prospectus of "A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature,"* compiled by M. Jastrow, Ph. D., of Philadelphia. If there is any department of Hebrew or Semitic study in which "aids" for the use of the

* To be published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

student are needed, it is in the line of the work proposed. The Talmud is a labyrinth to the ordinary student; and so truly is this the case that, outside of the Jewish scholars themselves, there may be said to be almost no students of the Talmud. With such a dictionary as this at hand, the task will not be the hopeless one it has hitherto been. The following extract from the "Prospectus" will furnish a general idea of the work proposed:—

"The lexicon, in its arrangement, method and conciseness, is to be like the modern dictionaries, which have made classical studies a pleasure. The old fashion of unsystematically hunting for phonetic coincidences in all possible languages has been rejected. But while the work is based on philological principles, it avoids the abstruse discussions which have made similar works in other languages repellent to the student.

"Presenting the development of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages during the nine hundred years preceding the eleventh century of the common era, it may claim to be a contribution to comparative Semitic philology. The foreign elements in those languages will guide the student of post-classical Greek and Latin to the knowledge of words and meanings which may decide mooted questions of dialect, and shed light on other obscurities in his province of study. For these purposes each part of the work as it appears is an independent monograph.

"The work will be completed in about twelve parts of 96 quarto pages each. Its price (\$2.00 a part) has been fixed as low as possible, so as to place it within the reach of all to whom it may be of service. The first part will be ready for delivery about the 15th of September, and if the proper support be extended, the parts will follow each other at intervals of about three to six months."

A Little Knowledge of Hebrew.—A little knowledge is not always a dangerous thing. It depends a great deal upon the person who has this little knowledge. If he is a fool, it may do him damage; if he is a man, and above all, a Christian minister with common sense and a clear conviction of duty, a little knowledge will prove to be a good thing. It may not be, quantitatively considered, a large amount of Hebrew which a student learns during a four weeks' attendance at a Summer School; but if rightly managed this small beginning may prove the basis of a solid superstructure. Everything depends upon the use made of this beginning. Men that come to a Summer School or who take a course in the Correspondence School are supposed to be of a kind that do so in order to learn, men who need not be driven, but only led. And experience has shown that, with such men, even the few weeks instruction in July or August has given them a fair start in becoming good Hebrew students, whose knowledge of the Old Testament tongue has been of great aid to them in their work. Then it must be remembered that most of these men have had some drill in acquiring languages, and this, together with the matured character of their minds and judgments, helps much toward making the Summer and Correspondence Schools a success.

Comparison of Greek and Hebrew.—Students who are somewhat advanced in Hebrew, and have a fair knowledge of Greek, will find it a most profitable study to compare, verse for verse, the Greek New Testament with the Hebrew translation of Professor Delitzsch; also the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament with the original Hebrew. Comparing the differences of the idioms of the two

languages, seeing how the same thought is expressed in both, will draw special attention to the peculiarities of both. The law of contrast works here also, and a close examination of the philosophical Greek diction and thought in the garment of the simple and natural Hebrew is full of surprise and instruction.

An Essay on the Book of Proverbs.—Attention is invited to the recent offer of a prize of fifty dollars by the Young Men's Hebrew Association for the best paper on "the Principles of Ethics in the Sayings contained in the Book of Proverbs, with an Inquiry into the Social Conditions which they reflect." We notice that the judges are to be Drs. Jastrow of Philadelphia, Gottheil of New York and Felsenthal of Chicago; that competition is open to all, and that the papers must be handed in before April 1, 1887.

Is not this a movement worthy of commendation, and of imitation? It is to be hoped that similar incentives will be offered by other organizations interested in Hebrew study. We trust that the number of those competing for this prize may be very great.

A Note from Prof. Hall.—The following Note from Prof. Hall will be self-explanatory. It is sincerely hoped that for the sake of Syriac learning in England and America, the proposed translation of Prof. Nöldeke's Syriac Grammar may soon be issued.

TO THE EDITOR OF HEBRAICA :—

With reference to an Editorial Note in HEBRAICA of April last, respecting a proposed translation of Nöldeke's Syriac Grammar, I beg leave to say, with Prof. Nöldeke's concurrence, that his letter to me was not intended by him for publication; and that its getting into print was through a misunderstanding. Also that the translation in HEBRAICA contained some slight oversights, though none unfavorable to the parties concerned. It was a mistake, also, to state that the proofs or sheets therein referred to were printed; whereas they were in manuscript only, containing about as much matter as a "Bogen" of the original printed German. Further, that the publishers have assured Prof. Nöldeke that they never thought of publishing the translation against his wish; and their direct correspondence with him has been that of honorable men.

Yours truly,

ISAAC H. HALL.

The Study of Syriac.—In the general awakening of interest in Semitic study, it may well be asked if the Syriac has not been neglected. The Hebrew is studied with renewed vigor, not merely as the medium of revelation and the vehicle of inspiration, but also linguistically and comparatively as "a branch of learning." Arabic has long been considered necessary for any one who will thoroughly understand the original forms of the etymology, the primitive meanings of the roots, and the most perfect development of the syntax of the Semitic tongues. Assyrian, too, is pursued with assiduity; for the history of the mighty peoples who used it as their vernacular, for the light which it throws upon the history and traditions of other primitive nations, and especially for its bearing upon the Hebrew language, literature and religion. But for the time being, Syriac seems to be relegated to an inferior position in the great Semitic family. We would not depreciate the merits of the sister languages; but it seems to be an opportune time for emphasizing the importance of giving more attention to this, which in many respects is the most interesting and attractive of them all. To the church historian there is no subject more inviting, and none which more needs investiga-

tion, than the history of the early controversies about the person of Christ, and of the sects and schisms which arose out of these controversies; and yet any thorough research in this line demands as a pre-requisite a knowledge of the Syriac, that we may hear both sides in regard to the questions in dispute, and that we may follow the fortunes of the so-called schismatic churches of the East. The hymns, also, of the Syrians, while they are stilted in form, and insipid to our taste, are revelations of the character and faith of the people who wrote and sung them, and of the life and doctrines of one of the greatest historic branches of the Christian church. The language is rich in such light literature as fables and tales; and possesses in manuscript many biographies and historic narratives which have never yet been published or translated. Many grammatical and lexicographical works, and valuable commentaries, such as that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, have never hitherto been accurately read. Who knows what treasures of learning and piety lie hidden within the covers of those two immense manuscript volumes of Theodore's commentaries, which are found in the Sachau collection in the Royal Library at Berlin? But more than for its general literature, secular and theological, the Syriac language is, and will remain, interesting to the biblical student, and almost essential to the textual critic of either the Old or the New Testament, because in it we have the oldest known version of the latter and the next oldest of the former,—the Peshitto; besides several other versions of great importance. We want Syriac scholars who will do for the Syriac versions what Tischendorf, Lagarde and others have been doing for the Greek. We want some American Gregories in Syriac to supplement the work of Martin, Cureton and Ceriani.

The Syriac language is, moreover, from a purely linguistic point of view, an interesting member of the Semitic group. Michaelis, in the preface to his Syriac Chrestomathy, contended that the study of it should precede that of the Hebrew, —the study, not of the versions, which afford at best but poor examples of what a language is capable of, but of the masterpieces of its native literature, which show us the breadth and fullness of its vocabulary, the intricacy and adaptability of its syntax. He seems to have thought that the Hebrew language, in both form and spirit, could only be rightly understood, or at least could be much more thoroughly and quickly understood, by those who had first mastered this cognate Aramaic dialect. Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, too, in the Prolegomena to his new Hebrew dictionary, emphasizes the close relationship existing between the roots of the Hebrew and of the Aramaic dialects. He says, on page 35, that "Hebrew lexicography in all questions, but especially for the explanation of the rarer Hebrew stems and words and for the elucidation of their fundamental meaning, must resort first of all to the Aramaic, and must not take counsel elsewhere till recourse to this has been had and had without avail." Now, what is true of Aramaic in general, is, perhaps, pre-eminently true of Syriac. It should, therefore, be thoroughly mastered by all who will teach the Hebrew language or who will comment upon the text or the meaning of the original Scriptures. It should be studied, not cursorily and for pastime, but scientifically and with painstaking accuracy. The genesis of its vowel-system, and the laws of its consonantal changes, its word-formation, syntax and prosody, should be studied in the light of comparative philology, and of its own historical development; so that, not at hap-hazard nor willfully, but according to law, we may gain a certain knowledge of the language itself and of the relation in which it stands to its sister languages, and of the light which it sheds upon them.

➤BOOK ❖ NOTICES.❖◀

LYON'S ASSYRIAN MANUAL.*

It is now pretty generally admitted that some knowledge of the Assyrian language is necessary to every Semitic specialist, and of prime importance in the work of Old Testament interpretation. Indeed, such strides have been made within thirty years in the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, and such light has been thrown by this means upon the fortunes and literatures of the ancient Semitic peoples, that students of these can no longer, with any sort of justice, allude disparagingly to the wide divergence of opinion among Assyriologists, and make the consequent uncertainty and difficulty the excuse for failure to undertake the study of Assyrian. As substantial agreement has been reached as to the principles by which Assyrian is to be deciphered and interpreted as we can hope to reach in the pursuit of any science whatever; and, as our knowledge of the Assyrian vocabulary shall improve, we may hope to see further uncertainties in regard to the values of the cuneiform signs gradually vanish, until there shall remain nothing but an insignificant minimum to remind us that there could once have been great difficulty arising from the various values of the signs.

The difficulties which have of late encompassed a beginner's path are well stated by Dr. Lyon in the preface to his Assyrian Manual, as follows: "Two great obstacles have stood in the way of those who desire to become acquainted with the language,—the lack of suitable books for beginners, and the large demand made on the memory for the acquisition of the cuneiform signs." It is safe to say that the labor of memory needed to acquire the signs would never prove irksome enough to drive scholars from the field. There remained, then, the lack of proper books for beginners.

And Dr. Lyon has taken a great step in removing this reproach from the door of the Assyriologists. Observing to what degree the acquisition of the signs has been complicated for beginners by their meager knowledge of the linguistic peculiarities to be expected, he has set before himself the problem of teaching the language through transliterated texts prior to any very close study of the originals or large practice with the signs. And therefore, in his selections for reading, he has given forty-seven pages to these texts against twelve in the cuneiform character. At the same time, for a gradual and pleasant introduction to the original, he has given five tables of signs to be used with the cuneiform selections and in preparing brief exercises. These tables offer, (1) a list of 287 Phonograms, giving all except very rare syllabic values, (2) a selected list of the ninety-two syllabic signs used most frequently, (3) twenty-four Determinatives, (4) 372 Ideograms, or ideographic combinations, including all used in the texts employed in the work, (5) the signs used for numerals when written ideographically. The Outline of Gram-

* AN ASSYRIAN MANUAL, for the use of Beginners in the study of the Assyrian language. By D. G. Lyon, Professor in Harvard University. Chicago: *The American Publication Society of Hebrew*. 1886. 8vo, cloth, pp. xlv, 138. Price, \$4.00.

mar contains twenty pages, the Notes thirty, and the Glossary forty-three, all in *brevier* type, forty lines to the page, against the fifty-nine pages of text in *small pica* and *cuneiform*, thirty-four lines and less to the page. The Glossary has the advantage over the *Lesestücke* of Delitzsch, and other books, in containing all the words found in the passages to be read (often under both the initial letter of root and that of derived word), as well as in being almost complete as a concordance to these passages. The labor involved in this valuable feature must have been very great. The Notes, while containing chiefly grammatical material, have such historical information as will throw light on obscure passages, and such references to the original as will make clear the author's preference in the case of doubtful readings, or which will explain the doubt. Nearly all the syntax offered is contained in these Notes.

As illustrating the progress which has been made in Assyrian study, it is interesting to note that, in the forty-seven pages of transliterated texts, there are but thirty-one ideograms and twenty-three syllables marked as doubtful, in some of these cases, even, the *meaning* being perfectly clear. For a few other words, the Notes offer different possibilities; but these are due chiefly to mutilations in the original. So the Glossary contains, for the fifty-nine pages of text, seventy-three words not defined at all, five words whose correct transliteration and meaning are uncertain, ninety-two whose meaning is not quite certain, nineteen whose roots are doubtful, though the meanings are not, and twenty-nine which, while not absolutely certain, are brought within very narrow limits of uncertainty; as, *šumbu a kind of wagon*, *šippatu a kind of reed*.

Probably the book will prove most serviceable in the hands of those who follow substantially the author's idea of the proper use of it, in his advice to beginners. After a thorough reading of the Grammar, he would have them begin with a certain five-page selection in transliterated form, opposite which he has had printed, in parallel pages, a word-for-word translation into English, and for which he has furnished very full notes with frequent references to the Grammar; and he gives minute directions as to the method here to be employed. At the same time, the student should commit each day a few of the selected Phonograms, and practice those learned by writing them and pointing them out in the cuneiform texts. After this, the selections should be taken up in the order of less to more difficult. Meanwhile, after some familiarity with Assyrian roots, the cuneiform selection of four and a half pages, already studied in transliteration, should be mastered, and then the remainder of the cuneiform; it being desirable also, as the student works on the transliterations, to make constant reference to the originals, in order to become familiar with the signs and methods of grouping them. As Dr. Lyon says, "Long before the student has accomplished all that is here marked out, he will be delighted to find that, if he is tolerably familiar with the list of signs, he will be in a position to translate, with a good deal of confidence, untransliterated historical texts."

There are few aspects in which this *Manual* is open to adverse criticism, and these are doubtless all incident to the pioneer character of the author's work. Some scholars will consider it a pity that the Outline of Grammar was not made fuller, particularly in the line of examples, and more systematic, even at the risk of approaching the analysis of other authors. This will occur to them especially in connection with the section on Phonic Changes and in those on verbs. The former might be retained in the memory somewhat more easily had the examples

been grouped under the old heads of Assimilation, Rejection, Addition and Commutation. The distinction between weak and weakest gutturals is not quite emphatic enough in § 27 to overcome the impression received by § 7. 2; nor are the cases of vowels retained after loss of a guttural (or changed to *i*) quite clearly distinguished from cases where they are lost altogether or where the guttural is assimilated. Leaving the question open as to whether there were in Assyrian the vowels ê and ô, it hardly seems possible that a+ŷ could give *i*, as appears to be stated in § 30 (but see § 8. 1), without previous change of ŷ to *ʾ*. A larger number of examples brought under the phonic principles in the Grammar would have rendered somewhat clearer the circumstances in which weak letters are exchanged or contracted, and those in which they are lost altogether. In view of the examples given under § 8. 2. c. d., the enquiry is worth making whether the vowelless letter is not in all the cases first assimilated, and then the *m* or *n* added to avoid a doubled consonant; the dissolution of doubling and use of *n* seem to be allowed in Note on 37¹³. The change of *t* to *d* after vowelless *g* noted on 18¹⁶ should find a place in § 8. of the Grammar. The Grammar might perhaps note in addition to the repetition of a consonant to indicate the accented syllable (§ 21. 3), and before suffixes (§ 9. 2), the same before *ma* (see Note on 42¹¹) and merely as orthographic variation (Note on 46¹⁸) and to mark a preceding vowel as long (Note to 42¹¹). It is gratifying to observe that ašar is not reckoned as a relative. It might perhaps have been stated in § 16. 2 that participles may form the masc. plur. in other endings than ūti (ūtū), for see Note on 7¹¹. So the occurrence of the noun in *u* for the construct is frequent enough, and is alluded to in Note on 19¹⁷ but is not mentioned in § 16. 4. Perhaps the declension of the first member of a compound, as seen in šanimma 19², aḥinna 46¹⁷ should somewhere have been noted. Šattišam 10²⁷ finds its only explanation in a note on 15²¹, where it would not be likely to be seen when wanted unless the attention were specially directed to it. In Note on 36²¹, a verbal form with final *u* in sing., even outside a relative sentence is recognized, and iṣḥupu 10²⁰, 12²³, 44⁸ and especially 10²⁵ when compared with iṣḥup 48²² may offer another example of it, though the Grammar seems to exclude the idea in § 24. 5. It is but occasionally that the author's method of using the type occasions even temporary uncertainty as to his meaning. So page 87, line 2, where the word "forward" occurs; page 97, line 30, where "or" separates two meanings, only one of which is allowable (cf. Note on 30³³), while on page 113, line 17, the two are allowable, and the proper one to be determined by a given context (cf. Note on 16²⁵). Only very rarely do the Notes show evidence of a change of view after the other portions of the book were prepared; thus kisalla 24¹⁶, 37²¹, 38¹⁵, 39¹⁷ should become, according to the Notes, šamnu; iṣar 20²⁶ defined in the Glossary as *thriving* would seem to have the meaning *abundance*, if we follow the translation given in the note. These points are perhaps too trivial to be noticed, at any rate they can easily be cared for in a second edition.

No one was better qualified than the author for undertaking such a work as this. For six years he has given the most of his time to Assyrian investigation. Nothing that has been written in this field has escaped him, though the method exposed in this volume is the elaboration of plans actually adopted and found to work in his own class-room. By this means, what it is safe to call the best Assyrian text-book for beginners (it is indeed the *first* really practical *introductory* book) has been made. For advanced classes, the book of Prof. Delitzsch will still

be needed even in this country; but for elementary instruction, it will doubtless be displaced here, and Dr. Lyon's book might very well be brought out abroad in German and French. Several instructors have already decided to use it with their classes. At Newton, where Assyrian has been introduced as one of the electives, and will be reckoned toward the required number of hours covering the full course, a class of three or four will this autumn begin to test the value of the work as a help in acquiring the language, and they expect to give the best part of their seventy-five hours of recitation to the material contained in this valuable *Manual*.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN,
Newton Centre, Mass.

LANSING'S ARABIC MANUAL.*

Aside from the intrinsic merits of this book, there are a number of reasons for giving it a warm welcome. It is a renewed indication that the revival of Semitic studies in America is widening and deepening; and an indication the nature and character of which is entitled to special notice. For the thoroughly scientific and philological study of the Semitic family of languages, and specifically also of the Hebrew, the Arabic must and will retain the fundamental position accorded to it by the history of the study of these languages. For the rational grammatical study of Semitic in general, and Hebrew in particular, the Arabic, by its very nature and genius, is entitled to the leading rank. And it is for the reason that those principles and factors which have controlled the growth and development of the Semitic languages, and which must be understood before a rational appreciation of the languages can be secured, find their best expression and development in the Arabic. It is true that some of the possibilities of Semitic expression of thought have, through the influence of the more flexible Greek, found a better development in Ethiopic than they have in Arabic. Nevertheless, the latter language, as a whole and in nearly all particulars, stands at the head of the Semitic group in importance for grammatical study. A convincing example and testimony of this fact is the present state in which the matter of Hebrew syntax stands. A satisfactory exposition of syntax is now the great desideratum of Hebrew philology, and has been for many years. Many grammarians have promised us a syntax, and no one has attempted to furnish one that goes beyond the rudiments. We think the reason for this is that, upon investigation, it is found that such a syntax, if it is to be thoroughly scientific, must be based upon a thorough knowledge of Arabic syntax, in which have found expression those methods of Semitic thought which are latent, or appear only in embryo, in Hebrew; and that such an understanding of Arabic syntax is only possible after a thorough study of the native Arabic grammarians. We doubt whether, under the circumstances, it will be possible in this generation for one scholar to cover this ground alone, and write a complete syntax. This is really more than a life's work. What the interests of the science demand are special investigations of the different elements of syntax, something on the plan of Driver's treatise on

* AN ARABIC MANUAL. By J. G. Lansing, D. D., Gardner A. Sage Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick, N. J. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*. 1886. Pp. xviii, 194. Price, \$2.00.

Hebrew Tenses, or, still better, of Philippi's discussion of the *status constructus*—a model in the best sense of the word. If the dialects are to be appealed to for the purpose of grammatical work in Hebrew, the chief stress must be laid upon the Arabic. The best interests of Semitic philology, in America, as elsewhere, demand that we have three Arabists to one Assyriologist. That these figures are inverted among us is not our good fortune, but our misfortune.

These words are perfectly in place in introducing to our readers what we think is the first Arabic grammar ever published in America. The author is the son of a missionary in Egypt, has spent twelve years of his life there, and, we understand, speaks modern Arabic as fluently as a native. This, in itself, would not of course enable him to write a good Arabic grammar; but he has evidently enjoyed a good philological training, and has succeeded in producing what we do not hesitate to pronounce an excellent manual. It embraces a grammar proper, a chrestomathy, containing several chapters of Genesis and several Suras from the Kuran, with specimens of grammatical analysis; and, thirdly, a glossary. The grammar proper is evidently to be the leading feature; and the other two are neither as complete as might be desirable, nor as satisfactory. For the grammar we have scarcely any but words of commendation. We were especially pleased with the terse, concise and clear-cut definitions which cannot be misunderstood. The general order of subjects is natural, while a few features, such as the substitution of English for German spelling of the *termini technici*, the introduction of "Exercises," and others, are especially noteworthy. We might differ with the author on this or that minor particular; but we do not think it the office of the critic to do so, as long as the book as a whole is worthy of a welcome. We cannot, however, suppress the belief that his special introduction on the three vowels in Arabic, as also the use which he makes of this in § 36 and elsewhere, and upon which the author seems to lay special stress, will be found to be of little practical advantage to the teacher or the pupil. We frankly confess we do not fully understand his theory in all its ramifications, and fear that this will be true also in the case of the beginners. His statements, of course, are based upon facts, and only these ought to have been stated. In a grammar that is intended to be only elementary, fixed facts and not philosophizing theories can be used, even if the latter are entirely correct.

The proof has been closely read, and the errata that remain are few and insignificant. We have examined the work carefully, and have completed the task with the conviction that Dr. Lansing's Arabic Grammar will serve the purpose for which it is intended. It would be an oversight not to mention with words of praise the typographical excellency of the book. The American Publication Society of Hebrew is to be congratulated upon the accuracy and elegant finish of the work. It is fully equal to the best that reaches us from abroad.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Columbus, O.

BEZOLD'S ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ASSYRIOLOGIE.*

The second number of the "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie," edited by Dr. Bezold, of Munich, contains valuable contributions by Professors Oppert and Schrader, Dr. Jensen and others. A feature of the number is a long article on "Old-Chal-

* Published at München, Price, M.16.—a year.

dean Art" by Dr. Reber, which is to be continued in the next number. Probably the most important article is that of Dr. F. Peiser, and certainly the most amusing that of Prof. Armand of Paris. Dr. Peiser shows by an ingenious method that the Assyrians followed a fixed order in the arrangement of the numerous signs of which the cuneiform writing consists. The question is a very important one, and the value of Dr. Peiser's discovery would have been still further enhanced, had he succeeded in finding some fixed principle in the succession of the signs. He believes the order to be based on mere graphical resemblances; but there are many difficulties in the way of this supposition. It is possible that, by reverting to a more ancient form of the cuneiform signs, a clearer connection between the signs that are placed in juxtaposition will become apparent.

Prof. Armand's article furnishes an interesting chapter on the history of "learned errors." Some years ago an inscription in cuneiform characters, and purporting to come from Cappadocia, fell into the hands of Prof. Sayce, the eminent English philologist, who expended a great deal of ingenuity in trying to decipher it. He gave two translations, one in 1881 and one a year later. The second was an improvement upon the first as far as the number of deciphered words went, but certainly no improvement as far as the sense of the inscription was concerned. Prof. Armand here shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that the inscription is the work of some "Shapeira," who clumsily tried to copy some cuneiform signs, and succeeded in so disfiguring them as to lead Prof. Sayce to suppose that he had a *new* form of cuneiform writing before him. The forger chose a short inscription found on the well-known bas-relief, coming from Kojundschik, and now in the British Museum, which represents Sennacherib sitting on his throne at Lachish in the act of receiving tribute. Above the head of the king are three lines of Assyrian, reading as follows:—

"Sennacherib the king of the legions, the king of Assyria, sits on the royal throne and receives the booty of the city of Lakis."

The inscription is one of the best known, so that it was not difficult for Prof. Armand, once having found the clue, to complete his happy "guess." Prof. Sayce is too great a scholar to feel chagrined at the error into which he has fallen, and will, no doubt, join in the hearty laugh which scholars are having at his expense. Prof. Chwolson was led astray by Firkowitsch, Prof. Socin by Shapeira's famous "Moabite Potteries," and Prof. Sayce will surely not close the phalanx of great scholars who have been the victims of great forgers. M. Clermont-Ganneau of Paris published, about a year ago, a little book on the "Frauds Archeologiques en Palestine," from which many will learn with surprise on how great a scale the manufacture of "antiquities" is carried on in the Orient.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

Philadelphia.

PRAETORIUS' GRAMMATICA ÆTHIOPICA.*

This little grammar is No. VII. in the "Porta Linguarum Orientalium" series, begun by Petermann and, since his death, carried on under the editorship of Strack, of Berlin.

* GRAMMATICA ÆTHIOPICA cum paradigmatis, literatura, chrestomathia, et glossario scripsit Dr. F. Prætorius, Prof. ord. universitatis wratislaviensis. 1886. Karlsruhe & Leipzig: H. Reuther. Price, M.6.—

It is gratifying to learn that there is a demand among students for an *elementary* Ethiopic grammar. It certainly adds still further evidence to the fact that a new and deep interest in Semitic philology is spreading over Europe and America.

Since the publication of Dillmann's "*Æthiopische Grammatik*" in 1857, very little has been done in Ethiopic grammar. With the exception of König's "*Neue Studien über Schrift, Aussprache und allgemeine Formenlehre des Æthiopischen*," published in 1877, nothing of importance has appeared. Dillmann's grammar has remained heretofore and will still remain the authority. The "*Grammatica Æthiopica*" cannot, in any sense of the term, be regarded as a rival of Dillmann's. The book does not claim to be critical or exhaustive. The author has given us, in a condensed form, the *essential elements* of the Ethiopic grammar. He has presented, in a clear and precise manner, and in as little space as possible, the necessary points of the grammar. One thing worthy of notice is the transliteration in Roman letters of the greater part of the Ethiopic words used in the text of the grammar. This is done in almost every case where any difficulty of pronunciation might present itself to the beginner.

Besides the grammar proper, there is given a full list of paradigms (pp. 1-18); a Bibliography (pp. 19-28); a Chrestomathy, containing the first four chapters of Genesis, taken from Dillmann's *Ochtateuch*, and several other small selections (pp. 29-45); and lastly a Glossary to the Chrestomathy (pp. 49-65).

It is a matter of regret that the author did not present us with an English, instead of a Latin, translation; for, as Dillmann remarks in the preface to his grammar, the latter language appears quite pedantic in an elementary text-book.

ROBERT F. HARPER,
New Haven, Conn.

NEUBAUER'S CATALOGUE OF HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.*

Hebrew bibliography is of comparatively modern date; but it has already attained to a high degree of perfection. Comparing the earliest and the latest Hebrew bibliographical works, we notice among the former the *Sifthe-yeshenim*, of Sabathai ben Joseph (Amst. 1680), with about 2,360 titles; while in the *Ozar ha-shorashim*, of J. A. Benjacob (Wilna, 1880), their number has risen to 17,000. This great progress is mainly due to the exertions of trustees and managers of public libraries in collecting literary treasures and in making their contents known to scholars and students at home and abroad by the publication of descriptive catalogues. The Bodleian Library excels in both these respects. It possesses the best collection of Hebrew works and the best catalogues. The Bodleian includes no less than fourteen distinct collections of Hebrew MSS., foremost among them being the Hebrew Library founded by Rabbi David Oppenheimer of Prague (1707). This Rabbi was the first among the Jews to collect books and MSS. systematically. He had a list of *desiderata* prepared, and employed agents to travel in all directions in search of rare and interesting works. His library was, however, moved from place to place; for a long time it lay at Hamburg stored away in boxes, hidden from the sight of man. No Mecaenas or institution was found on the Continent rich and liberal enough to rescue it out of the darkness. The Bodleian has

* CATALOGUE OF THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY AND IN THE COLLEGE LIBRARIES OF OXFORD. Compiled by Ad. Neubauer. With Forty Facsimiles. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

the merit of having brought this treasure of Hebrew learning to light and made it accessible to the public. Another important collection, likewise brought over from Germany, is that of the learned bibliophile Hyman Joseph Michael of Hamburg (born 1792).

Of the printed Hebrew books in the Bodleian, Dr. M. Steinschneider compiled an elaborate catalogue (1860), which, as Dr. Neubauer justly remarks, might rather be called "*Bibliotheca Judaica*." Part of the MSS. have been described by Johannes Uri, 1787, and also by Dr. Steinschneider in an Appendix to the catalogue. The present catalogue, compiled by Dr. Neubauer, includes not only all Hebrew MSS. contained in the Bodleian, but also those of the college libraries of Oxford. It possesses all the qualities required to make the work as perfect as possible. It is a rich source of interesting information, given in a concise and clear manner, "without discursiveness and without references to other catalogues or to periodicals, unless strictly necessary." The catalogue is not overstocked with research and learning, like the catalogue of the printed books in the Bodleian, nor filled with unnecessary and lengthy treatises, like the first instalment of the catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Cambridge University library. There is just so much information to be found in Dr. Neubauer's catalogue, and just so many extracts from the MSS., as those interested in the subject would desire to find in a work of this kind, without being compelled to go through a mass of literary discussions. Where necessary, Dr. Neubauer has spared no trouble, and has given the most detailed information. Such is, e. g., the case in No. 1390, which contains a "Hebrew translation of Aegidius' Commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*," and forty-nine philosophical treatises by various authors. Every one of these treatises is described by its full title. No. 814 includes forty-two *responsa*, of which likewise a full account is given. Two sections of the Catalogue, viz., Liturgy and Poetry, are especially distinguished in this respect. Siddur, Machzor, and Divan are unrolled before the reader from beginning to end. Not a single prayer, not the smallest poem has been omitted.

The age and country of each MS. is correctly stated where possible. That this is not always an easy task may be noticed even in the first MS. The date, as it at present stands—התתס"ד—is 5864 A. M. This is impossible, the present year being described by Jews as 5646 A. M. Mr. Neubauer, however, noticed an erasure in the first letter (*he*), and is perfectly right in assuming that the original *daleth* has been altered into *he* by some ignorant critic. The correctness of the conjecture (though finally abandoned by Dr. Neubauer himself, col. 1149) is supported by the error of Leon de Modena, who states that the MS. was written 5064. This scholar must have read *resh* instead of *daleth*; at all events, there was no *he* when he saw the date of the MS. in the year 1628.

The classification of Hebrew books presents likewise a peculiar difficulty, as the titles rarely give an idea of the contents of the book. One would hardly expect to find "*Libesbrif*" (No. 1420) in the section "*Ethics*," or *Ahabath betha'anugim* ("*Love in Delights*") among the theological works (No. 1291).

It is remarkable that this rich collection of Hebrew MSS., in which every branch of Hebrew literature is so well represented, contains no biblical MS. of earlier date than the twelfth century, and no complete copy of the Talmud. To some extent this fact may be explained by the hostility displayed in the Middle Ages by Christians towards Jews and their literature. The destruction of Jewish houses, synagogues, and colleges, with all their literary contents, was no uncom-

mon occurrence in those days of darkness and fanaticism. Cartloads of copies of the Talmud were confiscated and burnt. The loss of their books was felt, especially by scholars, as a more severe blow than the loss of all other valuables. Expression of this feeling we find in extracts given by Dr. Neubauer from MSS. Nos. 254, 326, 448. The entire absence of early copies of biblical books remains, nevertheless, a strange phenomenon.

Students of Hebrew literature, who may have to consult the Catalogue, will find great assistance in the numerous tables and indexes which Dr. Neubauer has prepared with so much care, and which are arranged in the most practical way. But, even independently of the Catalogue, the indexes are in many respects useful and suggestive. The antiquary, the philologist, the statistician, and the historian will find here interesting problems for further research. Of special interest and value as regards palaeography are the facsimiles which represent in forty plates almost all variations of Hebrew square, rabbinic, and cursive writings. Thirty-nine of these are taken from MSS. in the Bodleian library; and one (xlix.) from a St. Petersburg MS.

In conclusion, we congratulate Dr. Neubauer and the Bodleian upon the production of this useful and elegant work, and we hope that the British Museum will follow so excellent an example.

M. FRIEDLAENDER, in *The Academy*, (Aug. 28.)

➤SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.◀

- Assyrian and Babylonian Notes. (George Evans.) *Christian Reformer*, July, '86.
- I. Assyrische Lesestücke nebst Paradigmen, Schrifttafel und kleinem Wörterbuch, von Fried. Delitzsch. 3. Auflage. Leipzig. 1885. II. Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen und akkadischen Wörter der Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, Vol. II., von J. N. Strassmaier. Leipzig. 1886. (E.) *Expositor*, Sept., '86.
- BALJON, J. M. S. De testamenten der XII patriarchen. *Theol. Studien*, '86, 3 en 4, pp. 208-231.
- BREDENKAMP, C. J. Der Prophet Jesaja, erläutert. 1. Lfg. Erlangen: Deichert. 1886. 8vo, pp. 84.....M.1.50
- Catalogue Méthodique et Raisonné. Antiquités Assyriennes. Cylindres Orientaux, Cachets, Briques, Bronzes, etc. Publiés par M. de Clercq. Avec les colloborations de M. J. Menant,
 I^e Livre in fol. avec les pl. 1—10 en héliogr.....20fr.
 II^e " fasc. 1 " " " 11—16 et 37.....10fr.
 " " " 2 " " " 17—22 et 38.....10fr.
- Das Buch Al-Chazarî des Abû-l-Hasan Jehuda Hallewi im Arab. Urtext sowie in der Hebräischen Uebersetzung des Jehuda Ibn Tibbon herausgegeben von H. Hirschfeld. I. Hälfte. Leipzig. 8vo, pp. 1-160.....M.5.—
- Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie, aus verschiedenen Urkunden zusammengestellt und herausgegeben von E. Naville. Berlin: A. Ascher & Co. vi u. 212 Steintaf.; vi u. 448 lith. S., fol.....M.240.—
- DAUBAUTON, F. E. Het apokryphe boek *Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σαραχ* en de leertype daarin vervat. I. *Theol. Studien*, '86, 3 en 4, pp. 235-271.
- Der Einfluss der Gebirgswaldungen im nördlichen Palästina auf die Vermehrung der wässerigen Niederschläge daselbst. By L. Anderlind in *Ztschr. d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, VIII., 2, pp. 101-116.
- Der Prediger Salomo's von F. Hitzig. Herausgegeben von W. Nowack. Leipzig: Hirzel. (Thomas Tyler.) *Academy*, Sept. 11, '86.
- Die Keil-Inschrift von Aschrut-Daarga. Entdeckt u. beschrieben v. J. Wünsche. Publicirt u. erklärt v. D. H. Müller. Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*.....M.2.80
- Discovery of a Complete Version of "the story of Saneha." (Amelia B. Edwards.) *Academy*, Aug. 7, '86.
- Dizionario francese armeno e turco. Venezia. 8vo, pp. iii, 1573.
- GESENIUS, W. Hebräisches u. aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 10. Aufl., bearb. v. F. Mühlau u. W. Volck. Mit Beiträgen v. D. H. Müller. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel. 1886. 8vo, pp. xlii, 984.....M.15.—
- GUIDE, IGN. Testi Orientali Inediti sopra i Sette Dormienti di Efeso. (Testi copti, siriaci, arabi, etiopici, armeni.) Roma. 4to, pp. 107.....6fr.
- HALEVY, J. Recherches bibliques. 5: Les citations d'anciens chants dans l'Hexateuque. 6: Le temoignage d'Hosée sur la religion du royaume d'Israel. 7: Le verset d'Hosée, ix. 4. *Revue des etudes juives*, janv.-mars, '86.
- HALL. Syrian Antilegomena Epistles. *Athenæum*, July 3, '86.

- HOLSTEN, C. Ursprung u. Wesen der Religion. Thesen. *Prot. Kirchenztg.*, '86, 31, pp. 979-991.
- HUGHES. Dictionary of Islam. *Ind. Antiq.*, July, '86.
- Ichwân Es-Safa in Auswahl. Zum ersten Mal aus arabischen Handschriften herausgegeben von Dr. Fr. Dieterici. Leipzig. 8vo, pp. xix, 383.....M.20.—
- KAUTZSCH, E. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Namens יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. *Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1886, 1.
- KAYSER, C. Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa, übersetzt u. erläutert, zum Theil auch zuerst im Grundtext veröffentlicht. Leipzig. 8vo, pp. 216.....M.8.—
- KITTEL, R. Die Herkunft der Hebräer nach dem A. Test. *Theol. Studien aus Wuerttemberg*, 3. '86, pp. 187-220.
- KNABENBAUER, J. Commentarius in prophetas minores. Pars prior, sex priores prophetas complectens I. Paris: *Lib. Lethielleux*. 8vo, pp. viii, 486..fr.7.50
- LAMY, TH. J. Commentarius in Librum Geneseos. Tom. I.-II. Malines: *Lib. H. Dessain*. 8vo, pp. 398, 417.....10fr.
- LANSING, J. G. An Arabic Manual. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*. 8vo, pp. xviii, 194.....\$2.
- LYON, D. G. An Assyrian Manual for the use of beginners in the study of the Assyrian Language. Chicago: *The American Publication Society of Hebrew*. 8vo, pp. xlvi, 138.....\$4.
- MEYER, EDUARD. Der Stamm Jakob und die Entstehung der israelitischen Stämme. *Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1886, 1.
- NESTLE, E. Salomo's Alter bei seiner Thronbesteigung. *Theol. Studien aus Wuerttemberg*, VII., 2.
- PICK, B. Text-Varianten aus Mechilta und Sifré. *Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1886, 1, pp. 101-121.
- Die Tosefta Citate und der hebräische Text. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-29.
- REICHENBACH, A. Die Religionen der Völker. Nach den besten Forschungsergebnissen bearb. (In 5 Büchern.) 1. u. 2. Buch. München: *Ernst*. 1885. 8vo, pp. 230 u. 231.....each M.2.50
- RENAN, E. Les origines de la Bible.—Histoire et légende. *Revue des deux mondes*, March 1, '86, pp. 5-27; March 15, pp. 241-266.
- ROSENZWEIG, RABB. DR. ADF. Das Jahrhundert nach dem Babylonischen Exile mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die religiöse Entwicklung des Judenthums. Berlin: *Duemmler's Verl.* 1885. 8vo, pp. xvi, 240.....M.4.—
- (Smend.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 18.
- SOEDER, AMBROSIIUS. Ueber den alten Namen Gottes Jave. *Theol. Quartalschrift*, II., '86.
- SMEND, R., and A. SOCIN. Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab, für akademische Vorlesungen hrsg. Freiburg i. Br.: *Mohr*. 1886. 8vo, pp. iii, 35, mit 1 Steintaf.....M.2.50
- SMITH. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia. *Ind. Antiq.*, July, '86. *Athenæum*, July 17, '86. (Nöldeke.) *Ztschr. d. D. M. G.*, Bd. 40, Hft. 1.
- SOLOMON, PROF. A. S. A Translation of the 16th Psalm. *Jewish Times*, Sept. 10, '86.

ספרי הברית החדשה נעתקים מלשון יון ללשון עברית על ידי החכם
פראפעסאר פראנץ דעליטש מהדורה מסודרת באותיות גדולות
ומוגהת ומתוקנת מחדש על פני כולה הובא לדפוס על ידי חברת

מפיקי כתבי הקדש בבריטאניא וחוצה לה בשנת וזאת הברכה
לפ"ק 1885

הברית החדשה בהעתקה חדשה מלשון יון ללשון עבר מאת יצחק
זאלקינסאן אשר הובא לדפוס על ידי אוהבו בחייו ומוכירו לטוב
אחרי מותו כריסטיאן דוד גינצבורג על ידי חברת מוציא תורת
יהודה התמימה בשנת שאל"ו שלום ירושלם לפ"ק 1885

(E. Kautzsch.) *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 2, '86.

STADE, B. "Auf Jemandes Knieen gebären," Gen. xxx. 3; L. 23; Hiob iii. 12
u. אֲכַנְיָם Exod. i. 16. *Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissensch.*, 1886, 1, pp. 143-156.

TOMKINS, HENRY GEORGE. Takhpankhes. *Academy*, Sept. 11, '86.

Translation of Job xxxvi. (S. Davidson.) *Christian Reformer*, July, '86.

Twenty-one Years' Work in the Holy Land (a record and a summary): June 22,
'65—June 22, '86. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration
Fund. London: Bentley. 8vo, pp. 236.....3s. 6d.

VIGOUROUX, F. Etude critique sur l'authenticité du Pentateuque d'après l'exa-
men intrinsèque de son contenu. *Revue des questions historiques*, 1886, avril.

WILHELM, EUGEN. Königthum und Priesterthum im alten Erân. *Ztschr. d. D.
M. G.*, Bd. 40, Hft. 1.

WUENSCHÉ. Der Babylonische Talmud. *Athenæum*, July 3, '86.